Au 8/982-85/app.

corrected copy

Bureau of Land Management
Four-Year Authorization

Appendices

Report to the Congress for Fiscal Years 1982-1985

I 53.2:

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
October 1980

Table of Contents

1 **Summary of Consultations**

3 Alaska
5 Arizona
10 California
16 Colorado
20 Eastern States
22 Idaho
25 Montana
29 Nevada
33 New Mexico
40 Oregon
43 Utah
46 Wyoming
49 Summary of Review-Draft Comments

53 **Resource Area Planning Schedules**

67 **Audits and Evaluations**

81 **Management of Special Areas**

Summary of Consultations

In preparing its four-year authorization request, the Bureau wanted to insure that the programs it developed for the four-year period and beyond were responsive to public concerns. Beyond that desire, the Bureau was under direction from the President[1] to invite State and local governments and interested citizens to participate in making better-informed choices among alternative programs. To this end, the Bureau conferred with interested groups, citizens, and governmental units at the local, State, and national levels.

BLM's Area, District, and State Offices initiated consultation with local citizens, community leaders, local and State governmental units including Governors' offices, legislative representatives, State and regional user groups, and conservation and industry interest groups. Contacts with these groups and individuals were made through public and individual meetings, letters, telephone, and press releases. Similarly, public responses were received in person, by letter, and by telephone. In addition, comments received as a result of recent BLM program activities were reviewed by Area, District, and State Offices, and by the OCS Offices.

In December, 1979, BLM held a national public session in Washington with representatives of interested national organizations and interest groups. Written comments were solicited from these national groups.

These consultations focused on three principal questions:

- What will be the most significant issues, problems, and opportunities for the BLM-managed lands in the 1980's?
- What priorities should be given to these issues, problems, and opportunities?
- What are the most appropriate solutions or responses to these priority issues, problems, and opportunities?

The views and information provided to BLM as a result of its public participation efforts were used in defining the issues to be addressed in the four-year period and designing programs to respond to these issues.

A summary of responses received, completed by BLM State Offices, follows.

[1]President's Environmental Message, August, 1979.

Alaska

State Legislative Representatives

- Public participation not enacted in a timely fashion
- Land-conveyance process too slow
- Not enough decision-making authority at the local BLM level
- Increased communication and a conflict-resolution system are needed between BLM, State, and local governments
- Larger portion of budget should be spent for actual resource management and planning
- Combine cadastral survey efforts with State for efficiency

State Government

- Maintain high capability in fire suppression
- Maintain cooperative fire-management efforts with State of Alaska
- Develop cooperative management of State and private lands under the proposed land-bank concept
- Accelerate energy-mineral development opportunities for oil, gas, coal, and geothermal resources
- Develop resource budget for accelerated management in the event Alaska Lands Bill passes

Tribal Governments

- Decentralize authority and develop better policy guidelines for decision-makers on local issues
- Interim management and trespass abatement on selected lands and unapproved Native allotments need more attention
- BLM's biggest problem is the transition from a disposal agency to a resource agency
- In future, make more effort to inform rural Alaskan peoples about what BLM is doing and what BLM can do for them

Conservation Interests

- Allocate more funds to management of wildlife, special areas, water, air, and recreation
- Public needs more advance notice and more frequent meetings and workshops on major issues
- Resource management is not a high priority of BLM in Alaska
- Too many issues decided at political level and too few decisions made at local level

- Increase emphasis and funding to support inventory of basic resources
- Protect historic, recreational, scientific, and wildlife resources
- Assess all resources before committing an area to mineral development
- Land use planning should be BLM's highest priority
- Decisions about public lands should always consider local needs

Energy Interests

- Streamline public participation process and get more input from larger segment of public
- Provide more Federal land for oil and gas exploration
- Provide budget for early inventory and planning for energy needs
- Industry should participate in inventories
- Improve the procedure of issuing permits to eliminate duplication of enforcement and monitoring responsibilities among agencies
- Allow oil and gas data inventory on a continuing basis in the planning process
- Identify and define critical single-use values and areas

Non-Energy Mineral Interests

- Decision authority needs to be at local level
- Need laws and stipulations that apply to problems in Alaska
- Need to deal with public more directly and positively
- Coordinate with State of Alaska to consolidate mineral data storage systems
- Mineral development needs to be adequately planned to avoid "boom-bust" pattern
- Need more funding for management of mineral and other resources
- Policies should reflect needs of local economy

Recreation Interests

- Place emphasis on public use and recreation management
- Educate public about public land use
- Have public hearings instead of meetings, with recordation of public's actual wording
- Protect and conserve wildlife, historic, recreational, scientific, and scenic resources

	• Cooperative, planned development of public land is needed
Development Interests	• Open public lands to resource development
	• Need more funding for multiple-use management
	• Expedite land transfers
	• Streamline public participation process to reduce time and manpower needed
	• Resource management needs more emphasis
	• Economic extraction of minerals should be considered in management plans
Multiple Resource Interests	• Public participation materials must have clear, concise language without governmentese
	• More coordination needed among agencies to avoid duplication of effort
	• Need advice from populace in making public land management decisions
	• Place management priorities on real, identified needs

Arizona

State Legislative Representatives	• BLM should turn over land to the State
	• BLM is suppressing the livestock industry
	• BLM has too much staff
State Government	• Too much time is required for issuance of leases
	• Where mineral extraction is incompatible with other land uses, national needs and economic concerns must be given priority
	• Public participation at hearings to consider land uses should be limited to citizens of the State or area
Local Governments	• Federal lands should remain in public domain
	• It may be appropriate for more authority to be vested in Districts for responsive handling of requests
	• It is imperative to use our lands to the best advantage of all people

READEX FICHE

- It appears unwise to dedicate wilderness areas for use and enjoyment of a few people
- Continued use of public land for grazing purposes should have top priority
- Highest possible animal unit production should be maintained
- A land exchange program should be encouraged to consolidate holdings into blocks
- It is imperative that BLM work with Arizona in resolving access across BLM lands in areas of checkerboard ownership
- No public lands with frontage along the Colorado River should be released to Arizona in fulfilling "Trust Lands" obligations
- Continue in lieu selection by state but retain river frontage along Colorado
- Strongly encourage designation of ORV use areas on public lands
- More information and time should be given to review lease applications for BLM lands
- Concern expressed about effects that large-scale energy exploration and development activities might have on local facilities
- Need for coordination of oil and gas leasing with counties
- Make land available to counties for public development in urban areas

Agricultural Interests

- Concerned with uncontrolled use of public lands by recreationists
- Need to "block-up" land ownership
- Unfair to compare BLM grazing fees with private land fees without considering other users with whom a BLM permittee must share
- Thought should be given to an annual fee for access roads on BLM lands
- Burros must be kept at a constant level and not be allowed to increase
- Where lands are suitable, livestock production must have top priority
- Do not withdraw park lands along Colorado River as they provide good winter range
- Too much money is being spent on wildlife
- Too little land exists as a tax base in many western counties
- Very poor relationship between BLM and public
- Resolution of grievance procedures between BLM and land users

Conservation Interests

- Further limit the number of cattle on leased land
- Riparian areas are being depleted by overgrazing and ORV use
- There should be more information about BLM offered to the public as well as to schools
- Natural and historic areas should not be depleted for mining purposes
- BLM should work more harmoniously with the Forest Service on all regulations
- Mineral exploration should be kept to an absolute minimum
- Extra hearings or open houses on issues such as wilderness and mining should occur in more rural portions of the State
- Relative to public-lands users and adjacent landowners, BLM might slightly favor cattlemen and mining interests over wilderness
- Washington's push for special project inventories (for energy development specifically) should not be allowed to disrupt planning schedule

Energy Interests

- Development of energy projects is a high priority and should be incorporated in management plans
- Energy development should take precedence over environmental concerns
- Classify more lands in a multiple-use category
- Allow re-entry to areas of low or doubtful mineral evaluation
- Make expired non-competitive leases promptly available again by placing on a simultaneous filing list
- Provide for "one-stop" permitting to reduce or eliminate redundant permit requirements and repetitious court actions
- Modify regulations to permit expanded seismic surveys on BLM roadless areas with provision for restoration of scarified areas

Non-Energy Mineral Interests

- BLM has too much funding and staff
- Priorities for the 1980's should include energy development, hardrock mineral development, range management, land exchanges, development of open-access and nonstructural recreation
- BLM should consider issues such as economic impacts, long-range effects of minerals management, preservation versus multiple use and sustained yield, evaluation of wilderness potential, improving communications and notification, and improving coordination among agencies
- BLM needs to improve its processing of requests for permits, uses, and land exchanges

Recreation Interests

- Grazing should be kept at a minimum so land is not further depleted
- Keep more BLM lands open; do not block access
- There is a need for all-purpose ORV use areas
- Present insurance and bonding requirements are expensive and are eliminating small ORV groups
- Need analysis and practices to improve range forage, ground cover, water quality, soil stability
- Improve wildlife habitat
- Encourage recreational use
- Unique and scenic areas should be given primitive and/or wilderness class
- Roadway networks should remain as they are presently

Wildlife Interests

- High-priority issues are:
  - Land Use Planning
  - Partisan Influence in Resource Management
  - Efficiency in Government
  - Multiple-Use Management
- Objectives include creating and encouraging awareness of the need for wise use and proper management of the resources of the land, soil, forests, water, minerals, wildlife, plants, and air
- BLM should make more use of Advisory Boards

Universities

- BLM should have more funding and staff
- Favor intermediate and long-term goals over short-term impacts
- Minerals and energy are a top priority
- Need to educate public on environmental values and attitudes
- Need enlightened public involvement
- Planning is necessary and desirable
- BLM should evaluate carefully its policies and procedures for making allocation decisions among competing uses
- Resource potential and management effects need to be evaluated
- Need to gather data on resource potential under various combinations of management practices
- BLM should increase and improve efforts to gain information through research and monitoring

- Implementation must be cooperative and provide incentives for user support of their responsibilities
- BLM should encourage development and professionalism among the staff to face management problems; maximum authority for decision-making should be delegated to the local level; quality people should be recruited and hired; BLM should encourage continuing education including formal degree programs, refresher courses, and workshops; participation in local and national professional organizations should be encouraged and supported

Public Interest Group

- Consider short term versus long term
- Public involvement needs adequate funding and staff
- Energy development conflicts with recreation

Private Citizens

- Too few people know who BLM is
- Concerned about potential conflicts between BLM and Arizona Game & Fish Department
- BLM needs to step up public relations program in response to Sagebrush Rebellion
- BLM needs to enforce ORV regulations and recreation management
- Expedite land exchanges for public benefit
- Need way of economically controlling burro population on public land
- Must control ORV use
- Discourage additional use of public lands by military
- There should be more public involvement in BLM planning
- Provision should be made for preservation of unique and scenic sights and wilderness areas
- Zone areas for ORV use
- Reducing grazing capacity is a must in order to save the vegetation
- More research is necessary to help save riparian habitat
- Areas containing non-renewable (mining) resources should be made available for industry
- Should not use old data base in determining ORV use areas
- Wilderness open houses did not provide enough information
- There should be maximum user participation, a real return on investment

- Fee-paying users should not have to pay for improvement costs to benefit non-paying public
- There should be an active, aggressive set of programs to improve range conditions and stimulate additional AUM availability
- More BLM personnel should have practical range management experience and be in the field
- Improve BLM's handling of problems and opportunities
- Need better and more timely communication between BLM and interested citizens
- Provide better opportunities for more effective public involvement in BLM planning and management
- Improve BLM's response to public requests
- A real conflict to multiple use of lands occurs by locking them up for their wilderness recreation
- Of utmost importance is preservation of healthy livestock industry
- Cultural, aesthetic, and wilderness values should have lesser place than our primary needs
- Need more permanence in BLM range management personnel
- More management should be done in the district offices
- Reduction in regulations and red tape in states with large energy resources
- Need to have more realistic balance between development and environmental protection
- Policy and decisions are made by people too far removed from problem source
- Water development in District should be a top priority
- Have definite need for range improvement
- It seems that most decisions made in regard to wildlife are being made at direct expense of livestock use

Various Interests

- Multiple-use management of the Gila Box area

California

State Assembly Legislators and Legislative Aides

- Increased BLM funding to protect public land resources affected by primary resource uses

- Adequate BLM funding to review Plans of Operation (for surface protection)
- Provide ORV trails and facilities
- Termination of Federal management of public lands (Note: this is one Assemblyman's comment)

State Government

- Adequate soil surveys on lands subject to impacts
- Increased BLM ORV management
- Increased BLM cultural resource protection program
- Adequate funding for BLM land use planning, ACEC work, and public participation
- Increased BLM wildlife habitat improvements
- Increased BLM funding for contract with California Department of Forestry
- Fire patrolmen on lands during fire season
- Increased BLM fuels reduction efforts (prescribed burns)
- Authority for BLM law enforcement officers to enforce State law (bill now in U.S. Senate committee)
- More BLM easement acquisition funding
- More basic inventory data on resources
- BLM involvement in alternative energy source programs, i.e., biomass, wind power, solar
- Adequate BLM budget for land and easement acquisitions, State lands exchange work, cadastral surveys

Local Governments

- Comprehensive land use planning on public lands
- Continued BLM involvement in joint planning
- Recreation development
- Recreation access to public lands
- Prompt processing of public and local-government lands applications
- Management for the basic resource values
- Lands exchanges to improve resource management capability
- Prescribed burning to reduce fuel and improve livestock accessibility

- Encouragement of oil and gas exploration and development
- Mineral development with increased resource protection
- Public education by BLM regarding factors involved in public land management
- Retention of public lands under Federal management
- Some public lands should be transferred into private ownership to increase the tax base (separate comment from previous comment)
- Use of herbicides where needed
- Range rehabilitation and range improvements
- Fair payment by users of public lands to the Federal government
- Maintenance of existing livestock carrying capacities
- Control of wild horses
- Management of forest lands for optimum productivity
- Reforestation on public lands
- Protection of anadromous fish spawning areas
- Protection of water quality and other environmental values
- Orderly development of non-polluting energy (e.g., geothermal)
- Opposition to additional wilderness
- Elimination of unnecessary governmental red tape
- In-lieu tax payments to counties may not be adequate
- Increased across-the-board funding to properly manage public lands

Other Federal Agencies

- Forest Service/BLM cooperation in facilitating urban population participation in land use planning (joint public information centers)
- Forest Service/BLM cooperation in lands exchanges, boundary adjustments, and administrative adjustments
- Increased BLM cadastral survey and minerals evaluation capability to meet Forest Service anticipated needs

Agricultural Interests

- Protection and improvement of range resource conditions through more range rehabilitation and investment in range improvements, less paperwork and EIS writing time, and less "policing"
- Control of wild horse and burro damage to range resources; amend Wild Horse and Burro Act to permit commercial sale of animals

- More ground-water research and range management research directed at Desert use
- Economic security and tenure
- Prevention of vandalism and resource destruction
- Prompt wilderness decisions

Conservation Interests

- More on-the-ground BLM personnel
- More prevention of vandalism and land misuse
- More resource protection through rehabilitation and construction, as soon as possible (before costs inflate further)
- Continuation of inventories of threatened and endangered plants; implementation of protection measures
- More basic inventory data on resources
- Amend Wild Horse and Burro Act to permit commercial sale of animals
- Expand public information and education to promote understanding
- Reinstitute Johnny Horizon program
- More public participation

Energy Interests
(Including Utilities)

- Early BLM mineral evaluations and environmental evaluations prior to oil and gas lease offerings, with BLM capability to process on a pipeline basis with responsive and timely decisions
- Redirection of portion of oil and gas royalties (now paid to Federal Treasury) to fund minerals and environmental evaluations
- Equal consideration of mineral use with other uses in land use planning
- Opposition to locking up too much more land as wilderness
- Relaxation of restrictions against seismic work in roadless areas—permittees would rehabilitate
- More timely, better coordinated field work and processing by all agencies involved
- Industry involvement in revision and review of regulations
- Opposition to proposed quarterly system with competitive bidding—the current system works better for all involved
- Bigger BLM staff will be needed for processing under proposed new quarterly system
- Opposition to proposed legislative provisions for applying for a non-

competitive geothermal lease (a 45-day period followed by a 60-day period in which someone else may top-file)

- Early wilderness decisions
- Adequate BLM capability for utility-application field work and processing

Non-Energy Mineral Interests

- No change in 1872 Mining Law
- Aggressive energy and mineral development with mitigation of impacts
- More timely field work and lease processing
- More timely and detailed BLM mineral evaluations
- Equal consideration of mineral use with other uses in land use planning
- Don't try to inventory Hard Rock materials; Government (Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines) inventories can't be accurate; keep as much land open for mineral development as possible

Recreation Interests

- ORV management and facilities where warranted
- Availability of a variety of areas; this should reduce impacts on individual areas
- Cooperative ORV group/BLM programs; reinstitute Johnny Horizon program
- More on-the-ground BLM personnel
- Control of wild horse and burro damage on public lands
- Recreation access to public lands
- Sufficient access to public lands for rockhounding
- Opposition to additional wilderness (rockhounds)

Timber Interests

- Increased productivity of forest on public lands
- Increased BLM timber sales, especially in next few years
- Major BLM effort to rehabilitate and reforest unstocked lands
- Prompt wilderness decisions, considered on a State-wide basis
- Opposition to additional wilderness (separate comment from previous comment)
- Elimination of delays and superfluous restrictions associated with BLM timber sales

- Adequate funding for cadastral survey, easement acquisition, and survey and design in support of timber sales
- Lands exchanges to improve BLM and Forest Service resource management capability
- BLM and industry cooperation in technical studies such as wood waste utilization and energy farming (biomass)
- Opposition to too much public participation
- Energy development on public lands is also a high priority

- "Front-end" public participation
- Retention of public lands under Federal management
- Protection of water quality
- Increased supervision of grazing and Desert recreation
- More range rehabilitation and range improvements
- More wildlife habitat improvements, including anadromous fisheries
- Preservation of natural, cultural, and environmental resources for benefit of future generations
- BLM must learn how to function in the role of steward
- More favorable consideration of potential wilderness areas
- More multiple use rather than wilderness
- Control of wild horses and burros (unanimous comment)
- Opposition to reduction of grazing privileges where resources are in good condition
- Predator control
- Law enforcement to protect resources and property
- Recreation access to public lands
- Recreation development
- Increased timber productivity on public lands
- Reforestation on public lands
- Lands exchange to improve resource management capability
- More opportunity for urban expansion onto public lands
- More on-the-ground BLM personnel

- Increased services to users of recreation and wildlife areas
- Increased public education, on public lands and in communities
- Completion of King Range project
- Completion and implementation of Desert Plan

Colorado

State Government

- Access for inspection of reservoir-structure safety in wilderness areas
- Access to BLM lands for individual recreational pursuits
- Interchange of resource-inventory data through computer systems
- Concern for stability of agriculture from effects of grazing cuts from EIS's, from problems created by powerline rights-of-way, from energy impacts on land and on labor supply, and from pressure to convert agricultural land to residential use
- Need low-quality BLM land made available for housing development rather than for conversion to agricultural land
- Regulations make it difficult on small operator
- BLM is understaffed at activity level
- BLM's personnel turnover is too high
- Need access to public lands, especially hunting and fishing areas
- Need BLM to budget funds for river permitting
- Concerned with forage allocation for wildlife
- Concerned with threatened and endangered species habitat protection
- Concerned with loss of critical winter range for wildlife due to resource development
- Need funding and manpower to address trespass and access problems
- Need better inventory input

Local Governments

- Need management practices to ensure protection of water quality and compliance with 208
- Acquire critical floodplain and groundwater recharge areas
- Need closer coordination between cities, counties, and BLM regarding zoning, planning, and general day-to-day activities

- Need better access to public lands
- Need land made available for small town expansion
- Need decisions at local level to speed up process
- County zoning should apply to public lands
- Need coordination of Federal Oil Shale Leasing Program
- Need on-the-ground implementation
- Too much personnel turnover; people should stay in place longer
- Need to delegate more authority to local level
- Need better communications between BLM and County
- Locking up land in wilderness or for energy only takes away from economic base of cities and counties; need BLM to investigate effects of public land management on economic base
- BLM has responsibility to help mitigate impacts from mineral activity; need land for multiple use and not locked up; also mitigate income loss to counties where land removed from resource development
- Too much duplication by agencies; regulations not flexible enough for small towns
- Need to speed up process for land sales, leases, and exchanges

Other Federal Agencies

- Need land boundaries more clearly marked
- Need better firewood management
- Need better coordination and control of ORV's
- Need to coordinate access between agencies

Agricultural Interests

- Need to exchange small tracts of public land to block up ownership; this would benefit public land as well as ranch land
- Need for implementation of more range improvements
- Wilderness lands should be opened up for livestock use
- Need for better use supervision on AMP's

Conservation Interests

- Need for careful monitoring and regulation of the energy and mineral interests, especially in surface disturbance for exploration purposes
- Need for resources for intensive inventory and study of lands for wilderness designation process

- Need for rehabilitation and improvement of range lands
- Need for planning and quality management of BLM lands during development to safeguard public's interest in resource values

Energy Interests

- Accelerate wilderness process to focus on areas which have wilderness values and clear those areas which do not have wilderness criteria
- Expedite handling of rights-of-way applications
- Delays in processing applications
- Too much regulation and delay due to environmental constraints; delay due to lack of interagency cooperation
- Operators should only have to deal with one agency; too much regulation
- Too many permits; have to get permit to explore prior to applying for lease
- Would like to see standards set for performance, then dispense with some permitting requirements
- Need interagency task force to expedite permits
- Need to develop utility corridors in planning process
- Need better interagency coordination when industry initiates a project
- Need to eliminate District Office/State Office review duplication
- Environmental regulations increase cost of oil and gas drilling; lack profit due to increase of paperwork
- Rehabilitation with native vegetation, not exotics
- Need to clear larger areas for cultural resources
- Need to coordinate oil and gas drilling with oil shale mining
- Need decisions to be local to reduce time for permit issuance
- Issue is utilization of all resources on, in, and under public lands
- Issue is excess of regulations which hinder resource development and regulative interpretation by agency

Historical and Cultural Preservation Interests

- Need to protect cultural resources
- Need for intensive cultural-resource inventories to develop a significant data base

Non-Energy Mineral Interests

- Need better control of mineral trespass
- Takes too long for mineral surveys
- Too much red tape; takes too long to process applications for resources (sand and gravel, etc.)
- Mineral evaluation of wilderness should include drilling
- Federal lands should be assessed for mineral production
- Too much land tied up prior to mineral investigation

Recreation Interests

- Need access to Colorado River and other heavily used rivers
- Need better sign program
- Need better access to public lands
- Need to provide ORV land and provide better control of ORV areas
- Need public land better identified
- Need on-the-ground program enforcement for providing use supervision
- Need to aim toward balance between developed and use-generated or oriented recreation facilities
- Need to become more positively visible to gain public understanding, involvement in, and support of BLM as an agency
- Need program of interpretation to educate public in responsible use of public lands
- Need better management and responsiveness on remote areas and also work toward more cooperative management in semi-urban and urban areas
- Need emphasis on development of trails for non-motorized use (i.e., horse and foot trails)

Timber Interests

- Agencies should coordinate public meetings to avoid duplication; too much red tape
- Need more authority delegated to the District level
- Need forests managed for Christmas tree production as well as saw timber
- Want land retained in Federal ownership
- Washington should listen to field personnel
- Wants forestland fully utilized rather than going to waste either in wilderness or from lack of management

Other Interests

- Need surface protection for oil and gas development
- Let one agency handle surface protection, i.e., BLM
- Need to provide land for Rangely growth
- Need to provide recreation opportunity
- Need control of fuelwood situation
- Wants coordinated efforts for Search and Rescue
- Need access to reach higher elevation for snowmobiling
- Wants BLM land available for Environmental Education

Eastern States

Energy and Non-Energy Mineral Interests

- Need for fuller and more accurate inventory of Federal energy and non-energy mineral holdings in the East
- Reduce delays by resolving problems in areas of status, adjudication, and inter-agency coordination pertaining to competitive leasing of oil, gas, and coal; particularly on acquired lands in the East
- Expedite methods to detect, prosecute, and prevent theft of oil and gas, phosphate, and other minerals
- Improve data base and availability of surface land for prospecting
- Expand two-year limit on hardrock minerals and develop enhanced system for handling permits
- The Federal mineral estate needs to be re-determined enabling greater productivity

Conservation and Natural Resource Interests

- Need to establish and maintain a complete resource data base and conclude management plans
- Resolve ownership status of lands where the Bureau of Land Management's authority and responsibility are in doubt
- Determine policy regarding transfer of mineral interests from the Federal Government
- Accelerate application process for use or title to public lands
- Plan land usage on BLM-administered land to improve compatibility with adjacent local/state jurisdictions

Timber Interests	• Develop a timber management program for BLM-administered forestland in Minnesota
	• Need a specific plan for the management, protection, and maintenance of the vegetation resources on the Minnesota Islands
	• Identify and develop peat resources while protecting unique ecosystem and habitat values
Range Interests	• Expand Eastern States Adopt-A-Horse Program thereby directly improving Western BLM rangeland-improvement mandates
	• Rectify costly mismanagement and poorly enforced Adopt-A-Horse Program
Recreation Interests	• Plan for recreation management on BLM-administered islands with emphasis on multiple use
	• Need for recreation inventory of 2,778 islands and over 43,000 upland acres in Minnesota
	• Need prompt wilderness decisions which do not preclude management options for other resources
Environmental Interests	• Mitigate possible adverse impacts associated with mineral development particularly water-related impacts
	• Need to resolve severe water-related environmental problems created by illegal entry onto the Federal mineral estate
	• Need more research relative to public lands being used as dumping areas for toxic substances
	• Adequately plan for the protection and preservation of wetlands, floodplains, and municipal water resources during mineral development
Wildlife Interests	• Threatened and endangered plant and animal species must be identified and then protected prior to leasing
	• Assurances that designated wilderness areas do not preclude wildlife-habitat improvement work
Special Areas Interests	• Alternative means of identifying, designating, and protecting areas other than wilderness; expedite ACEC process
Historical and Cultural Preservation Interests	• Early planning and inclusion of cultural-resource protection programs need to be expanded to improve our surface and mineral management requirements

- Resolve pending cases of lighthouse-reserve revocations to eliminate damage or destruction through neglect, vandalism, and natural processes

Public Awareness Interests

- Increase public awareness efforts
- Incorporate local opinions in decisions to be made
- Current BLM policies, procedures, or practices should not be changed without benefit of individual States having opportunity to review and comment prior to implementation.

User Interests

- Improve responsiveness and timeliness of applications and requests
- Minimize duplication, reporting requirements, and cost of producing Environmental Assessments (EA's) which delay permitting and leasing activities
- Modify BLM cadastral survey procedures to eliminate conflicts with certain States
- Increase productivity, efficiency, and accountability of cadastral surveys; adequately plan and budget for external requests made to BLM

Law Enforcement Interests

- Increase scope and quality of law enforcement relative to minerals, lands, and wild horses and burros

Idaho

National Legislative Representatives

- Wilderness designations should not preclude mining and energy development, and should be limited to minimum size.
- Birds of Prey National Conservation Area should not prohibit agricultural development nor energy development.
- Forage allocation should not result in adjustments that would force livestock operators out of business. Some means should be devised to minimize adverse economic effects of range-use adjustments.
- Range improvements need to be accelerated to stabilize and improve range conditions and to implement intensive grazing management.
- Decisions on local problems should be made by local BLM officials.

State Legislative Representatives

- The Idaho Legislature is considering legislation which attempts to acquire public lands. The legislature supports the "Sagebrush Rebellion" and has stated its support of the rebellion in other western states. The sagebrush rebellion is a complex issue involving many facets—the

major points being that BLM management should give priority to local users and uses and local situations, as well as improved services.

State Government

- State selections to satisfy the lands in lieu of those sections which would have passed to the State as part of the Statehood Act should be granted without discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. BLM has not taken timely action.
- BLM has not taken timely action on State Exchange applications.
- More local action should be possible on Carey Act and Desert Land Act applications, i.e., decentralized decision making.
- Forage allocations and range adjustments should minimize adverse economic impacts—more funds should be available for construction and maintenance of range improvements.
- Energy exploration and development should be facilitated by BLM actions, not hampered.
- The public needs to be informed and involved early in inventory, planning, and EIS efforts.
- The public should have more opportunity to participate in decision making on public lands.
- Wilderness designations should not hamper economic development and existing uses.
- The proposed Birds of Prey National Conservation Area should not preclude new agricultural development nor adversely affect livestock grazing.
- The State is entitled to three million acres under the Carey Act.

Local Governments

- Land for community expansion, sanitary landfills, and other community uses should be made available.
- BLM management should stress economic stability, particularly livestock grazing.
- Access to public lands should be improved.
- Sand and gravel should be made available from public lands.
- Management of wild horses and burros should consider existing uses and the carrying capacity of the public lands. Economic uses such as livestock grazing should have priority.
- The public should be involved early in inventory, planning, and EIS efforts. Public participation should be maintained or improved.

Agricultural Interests

- Agricultural applications under the Carey Act and Desert Land Act should be approved immediately.

- The proposed expansion of the Birds of Prey National Conservation Area should not be approved since this would preclude or hamper new agricultural development.
- The State of Idaho is entitled to three million acres under the Carey Act.

Conservation Interests

- BLM needs to improve management of rangeland to provide for improvement in condition, soil protection, and water quality.
- Long-term productivity should be assured.
- Wildlife habitat is being diminished by several kinds of developments (agricultural, residential, industrial, highways, etc.) and wildlife habitats should be protected from further alterations or eliminations.
- Impacts of livestock grazing on riparian habitats need to be studied, monitored, and protected to assure continued use by fish and wildlife.
- New agricultural development is detrimental to many kinds of wildlife and should not be approved.
- Access to public land should be improved.
- Opportunities for public involvement need to be improved.

Energy Interests

- Actions need to be taken in a timely manner on oil and gas and geothermal applications. Restrictions on energy development should be minimized.
- No new wilderness areas should be designated if these would preclude energy exploration and development.
- Areas on public lands should be kept open for leasing or location.

Non-Energy Mineral Interests

- Phosphate development should be facilitated through continued leasing of public land. Leases should contain reasonable restrictions.
- Wilderness designations should not preclude mineral production—they should be left open to mining.
- Mineral applications need to be processed in a more timely manner.

Recreation Interests

- Public lands should remain open to ORV use.
- Special areas are needed for exclusive ORV use.
- Access to public lands needs to be improved.
- Bruneau, Owyhee, and Salmon Rivers should be added to the national system.

- A plan for the lower Snake River in eastern Idaho should be approved and implemented.
- New wilderness areas in Idaho should be added to the wilderness system.

Timber Interests

- More timber should be made available from public lands to prevent decreased employment and to stabilize local mills.
- Public lands should be reforested to assure a future supply of timber and wood products.

Livestock Interests

- Reductions in livestock grazing on public lands should not produce severe economic impacts. Reductions in grazing should be minimized to preclude forcing users out of business.
- Range improvements are needed to improve range conditions and provide livestock forage.
- Wilderness designations are not needed and these would hamper livestock grazing and preclude range improvements.
- Maintenance of existing range improvements should be increased.
- EIS's are too costly; this money should be spent in on-the-ground developments.
- Wild horses and burros need to be controlled to prevent deterioration in range conditions.

General Interests

- Public participation should be improved to allow the public an opportunity to contribute their concerns and ideas prior to decision making.

Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota

State Governments

- Need full BLM funding to implement energy-related plans. Accomplish in association with State capability
- Should be more emphasis on rangeland improvements and to accommodate more grazing
- Current BLM vegetative allocation program will not allow an adequate allocation to wildlife
- Environmental programs seem to be overshadowing important resource activities, such as grazing, timber, minerals, and watershed
- There is a lack of on-the-ground management of the Upper Missouri Wild and Scenic River, and lack of a positive management thrust

- The Garnet Ghost Town is not being adequately protected
- BLM State Director should be given more authority on land-exchange decisions; do not react quickly on proposals by other government agencies
- Land identification should be top priority and done on a parcel by parcel basis in combination with use inventories
- Implement land ownership adjustments for a more manageable pattern between state, private, USFS, and BLM
- BLM should take an aggressive stance on leafy spurge control
- Should be a definite policy on allocation of water among conflicting resources
- Controversy between BLM and livestock industry because of aerial gunning restrictions for the Gray Wolf (threatened and endangered species)
- BLM does too much unnecessary planning and paper shuffling with limited on-the-ground results
- BLM is not processing its applications for withdrawals, public sales, R/W, R&PP, free-use permits, and leases in a timely manner
- Seems to be a duplication of effort in conducting wildlife studies, inventories, and jurisdictional duplication between State and Federal agencies
- BLM should allocate the full State payment in lieu of taxes
- BLM should receive increased funding to allow early coordination with the State governments during initial phases in initiating Bureau procedures.

Local Governments

- BLM not processing its applications for withdrawals, public sales, R/W, R&PP, free-use permits, and leases in a timely manner
- BLM is unable to react quickly to land-exchange proposals made by other government agencies

Other Federal Agencies

- Land ownership adjustments need to be implemented for a more manageable land pattern between State, private, Forest Service, and BLM

Agricultural Interests

- BLM needs to complete a total planning effort on all lands, including private, to include agricultural resources for the coal program
- There is a concern that there will be major grazing reductions based on the SVIM program
- The historic inadequacy of BLM administration of the range program has caused public concern over the agency's ability to manage in a more

timely manner following EIS completion

- Are concerned that BLM will not be able to implement AMP's following EIS completion
- BLM has an image in its planning efforts of making decisions prior to requesting public input
- BLM employees need to participate more in public affairs and community involvement
- BLM policy of shifting personnel is disruptive and not cost-effective
- BLM should eliminate dispersed, isolated tracts
- State Director should be given more authority on exchange decisions
- There is a need to establish a sound water needs/rights identification program and a relationship between Federal and State government in coordinating water-rights filing
- Degradation of national water supplies is being caused by multiple-use pressures
- Increasing conflicts are developing between the livestock industry and wildlife conservationists on prairie dog management
- BLM is too institutionalized and not responsive to individual needs; this is especially true in the range program where individual cases are not adequately considered
- BLM does too much unnecessary paper shuffling with limited on-the-ground results
- Lack of field authority is a limitation to BLM ability to respond to on-the-ground problems
- There is an inadequate working relationship between the public, land-use permittees, and BLM concerning multiple land uses

Conservation Interests

- Concern that the vegetative allocation program will not allow an adequate allocation to wildlife
- Increasing conflicts are developing between the livestock industry and wildlife conservationists on prairie dog management

Energy Interests

- BLM needs to initiate a better allocation process for community-related resources
- BLM needs to complete a total planning effort on all lands to include agricultural resources for the coal program
- Protest and appeal procedures for coal leases are inadequate

- BLM is not able to handle the increasing demands for energy exploration and development
- There is inequitable prioritizing for local input on energy development matters versus national input
- Concern that BLM is not properly using public input
- BLM is making decisions within the coal management program without adequate information
- BLM must expedite permitting and development of energy resources and improve coordination with the energy industry
- BLM policy of shifting personnel is disruptive and not cost-effective
- BLM does not adequately consider water resources in their management of minerals
- There is concern with the potential tie-up of public lands by the wilderness study areas pending Congressional action; an accelerated program is necessary
- Access to public lands is blocked by private ownership

Historical and Cultural Preservation Interests

- The Garnet Ghost Town is not being adequately protected

Non-Energy Mineral Interests

- BLM is not processing its applications for free-use permits and public sales in a timely manner

Recreation Interests

- Employees should participate more in local affairs to achieve more community involvement
- There is a lack of on-the-ground management of the Upper Missouri Wild and Scenic River, and lack of a positive management thrust
- The recently completed Fort Meade Recreation Management Plan should be implemented; interest was heightened as a result of recent ORV damage near Sturgis, South Dakota
- Concern expressed that recreational visitor use is not being managed, leading to resource degradation in some areas
- Concern that public input into the wilderness program is not being used
- Potential tie-up of public lands by wilderness study areas pending Congressional action; a more accelerated program is necessary
- Access to public lands is blocked by private ownership
- BLM needs to designate public lands for ORV use

- Concern that BLM will not be able to administer ORV designated lands
- Concern that BLM is not adequately managing visitor use on public lands
- BLM is not processing applications for withdrawals, Rights-of-Way, Recreational and Public Purposes Act actions, free-use permits, and leases in a timely manner
- There is an inadequate working relationship between the public, land permittees, and BLM concerning multiple land uses

Nevada

State Legislative Representatives

- Release lands contiguous to cities
- Improve access to public lands
- Increase and accelerate range improvements
- Delegate more authority to local BLM offices

State Government

- Faster completion of wilderness inventories/designations
- Resolve the water rights issue
- Manage wild horses more effectively
- Increase delegation of authority to field offices
- Accelerate and expand land sales, transfers, exchanges, and acquisitions of key tracts for their public values
- Accelerate the land-use decision making process
- Accelerate completion of the grazing EIS schedule
- Provide more public information (status of actions, procedures, and services)
- Accelerate issuance of new regulations flowing from FLPMA
- Manage rangeland to produce adequate wildlife numbers
- Faster completion of Wildlife Habitat Management Plans
- Improve access to public lands
- Increase range improvements for better management
- Mitigate impacts of the proposed MX Missile project
- Effectiveness and feasibility of DLE and Carey Act laws need to be studied

- An analysis of the distribution of receipts from sales of public lands is needed
- BLM must provide rationale and feedback behind BLM decisions
- Cumulative effect of all withdrawals should be analyzed
- Funding for mineral resource inventories (USGS/Bureau of Mines) should be increased
- Need thorough analysis of levels of mineral inventories in relation to levels of other inventories
- Develop power-line corridors
- Increase funding for geothermal program
- Resolve water-versus-mineral question (geothermal)
- Emphasize small oil production programs
- BLM must be responsive to processing actions
- Riparian habitat needs to be managed and protected for streams and aquatic habitat
- Land exchanges are needed to block up checkerboard lands

Local Governments

- Release lands contiguous to cities
- Increase water developments for wildlife
- Increase use of forestry products
- Accelerate rights-of-way for roads
- Need closer cooperation with local entities
- Process applications faster
- Manage wild horses more effectively
- Block up checkerboard lands
- Increase delegation of authority to local offices
- BLM's credibility is bad, need better public information/public relations
- Too little guidance and planning in wilderness program, when mineral development should be increased
- Need more range improvements
- Some environmental protection conditions should be relaxed
- BLM should encourage mining

- Increase number and quality of maps and brochures
- Limit Desert Land Entry to existing owners of agricultural lands
- Organize BLM district boundaries along county lines
- Make public land available to cities, but only for R&PP
- ORV areas should be designated
- Accelerate Desert Land Entry program
- Develop law enforcement cooperative agreements
- Multiple use should be stressed — not wilderness

Agricultural Interests

- Provide access to public lands
- Increase delegation of authority to local BLM officials
- Land exchanges are needed for solving intermingled land problems
- There should be higher priority for land treatments
- Increase public information
- Bureau planning system lacks livestock advocate
- Need private participation in water developments
- Manage wild horses more effectively
- Concentrate on multiple-use development of springs
- Accelerate and expand range developments/improvements
- Anticipate and plan for MX impacts
- Develop forestry program
- Develop powerline corridors
- BLM programs (wilderness, etc.) should be more responsive to local input
- Increase funding to meet food, energy, and mineral production
- Accelerate DLE applications and notify applicants of status
- Range suitability criteria need to be revised
- Grazing fees should be adjusted in relation to range improvement

Conservation Interests

- Manage wild horses more effectively

	• Publicize wildlife project developments
	• Mitigate impacts caused by MX Missile project
	• Manage/rehabilitate riparian habitats
	• Increase public information/public relations
	• BLM's planning horizons are too short
	• Increase recreation management funding
	• Use proceeds from land sales to purchase sensitive environmental lands
	• Develop geothermal energy in non-sensitive environmental areas only
	• Develop solar energy programs on public lands
	• The ACEC program should be promoted
	• Block up checkerboard lands
	• The 1872 Mining Law should be reformed to reflect FLPMA
	• ORV use should be limited to designated areas
	• Delegate more authority to local officials
Energy/Non-Energy Interests	• Accelerate completion of wilderness inventories
	• Need coordinated planning for transmission-line corridors
	• Environmental process is too slow
	• BLM should encourage mining on public lands
	• Accelerate land sales with proper restrictions
	• More effective wild horse and burro management
	• Delegate more authority to local BLM officials
	• Wilderness program is unrealistic; procedures are creating de facto wilderness areas
	• Increase funding for BLM mineral resource inventories
	• Congress should not upgrade airsheds to Class I standards
	• Comment periods on regulations are too short
	• Increase public information to aid public land users
	• BLM should be more responsive to local input
Wild Horse and Burro Interests	• There is a need for increased and more effective management of wild horses and burros

- Increased inventories/studies are needed
- The BLM should strive to handle all aspects of the wild horse and burro program humanely and efficiently

New Mexico

National Legislative Representatives

- Place special emphasis on complying with Section 8 of the Rangelands Improvement Act requiring coordination with the State and private persons affected by BLM grazing decisions. Without careful attention to Section 8, the proper management of the rangelands will continue to be frustrated as time is spent on arguing the mechanics of the decision making process rather than on the decision itself. The consultation policy adopted by BLM in New Mexico to assure this coordination will certainly assist in achieving this goal.
- There is an urgent need for the development of energy resources and mineral reserves on public lands. The Bureau should plan carefully for this need and study methods by which the public lands can be preserved for grazing, recreation, wildlife, and other uses while allowing for the development of energy and mineral resources. In some instances this will be impossible; however, as new exploration, production, and reclamation technology is developed, the Bureau may find it possible to assure compatibility of uses in cases where it previously could not.
- The Bureau must balance the upgrading of its lands and the impact of its actions on local economies. Reasonable and balanced policies should be worked out through coordination with the State and private interests.
- BLM land management policies should be as consistent as possible with those of other Federal agencies, State and local governments.
- BLM needs more emphasis on public relations to let the public know what and why actions are being taken. The "them against us" feeling must be eliminated.
- If the Bureau finds itself under time constraints or other mandates which prohibit the development of comprehensive and responsible policies, it should appeal to Congress for assistance when possible.

State Legislative Representatives

- A "Sagebrush Rebellion" bill was recently approved by the Legislature and signed into law in New Mexico.

State Government

- The two most crucial public-land issues are the production of energy and livestock.
- The Section 8 Rangeland Consultation Policy developed in New Mexico is a significant step forward in Federal-State relations. It is critical that BLM effectively implement this policy.

- The scientific validity of the range environmental impact statements is dubious.
- BLM should seek policy or legislative changes, if needed, to ensure that permittees can carry out normal activities associated with a ranching operation in Wilderness Study Areas.
- The rapidly expanding development of energy resources is a major threat to paleontological, archeological, historical, prehistorical, and cultural evidence about our past on public lands. The BLM should give a higher priority to the inventory, evaluation, and management of these heritage resources.
- Habitat trends in areas which have significant wildlife values should be monitored to assure that forage quality and quantity are not further degraded by competitive uses.
- There are many areas of public land where roadways are spaced much more closely than can be justified under any circumstances.
- Gaining legal access to BLM lands should be given a higher priority.
- Air and water pollution, excessive water consumption, and hazardous materials and wastes could be the adverse by-products of energy mineral development on BLM-administered land.

Local Governments

- BLM should exchange public lands suitable for urban development for private lands located within flood plains in order to help preserve riparian habitats, provide recreation opportunities, and reduce potential damage from flood hazards.
- BLM should respond in a more timely manner to the needs of cities and counties for: (1) residential and commercial expansion thereby alleviating pressure to develop valuable agricultural land; (2) sites for sanitary landfills, schools, parks, airport expansion, industrial parks; (3) road and utility rights-of-way.
- The leasing of energy minerals and the processing of related projects should be greatly expedited.
- BLM should make complete assessments of the impacts of the possible selection of BLM lands and private lands in northwestern New Mexico for relocation of the Navajo peoples as a result of the Navajo-Hopi Settlement Act.
- BLM should be more responsive to local needs and show the public it can make decisions and do the job that needs to be done in a timely manner. This includes transferring more decision-making authority from the Washington Office to BLM Districts.
- Many communities will be adversely affected by Wilderness Study Areas because they will lose employment, firewood, and recreation opportunities.
- BLM needs a land exchange and disposal policy which is more responsive to local needs.

- BLM policies are dictated by the densely populated eastern states where BLM land does not exist.

Other Federal Agencies

- Provide more decision-making authority to BLM State, District, and Area Managers within clear policy guidelines.
- There needs to be more and better communication and involvement of affected and interested publics in the decision-making process. This includes more effective coordination with other agencies.
- Agencies having similar missions should have common policies and procedures in order to reduce inefficiency and achieve a greater understanding by the public of the rationale behind decisions that are made.
- BLM should expedite the processing of various applications. The review and approval process should be streamlined.
- Interpretive education programs for the general public are needed in order to develop a wider understanding of important resource values and greater support for their preservation.
- The BLM Washington Office should speed up approval of cadastral surveys.
- BLM should do more to control ORV use because of the damage that is occurring.
- The harvesting of fuelwood within riparian zones is having a substantial adverse impact on habitats for wildlife and migratory birds.

Agricultural Interests

- BLM's rangeland management program is a threat to the economy of ranchers and local communities.
- The impact of public land grazing on the national beef supply is grossly underestimated by BLM.
- BLM's role should be that of a landowner-lessor rather than a controller of ranch operations. A rancher's living depends upon adequate resource management. With help from the scientific community, the rancher will do the best job without harming the resources.
- BLM does not give adequate consideration to the role of soil moisture in rangeland condition and production.
- BLM takes far too long to make decisions.
- BLM's policy of putting decisions into full force and effect pending appeals is an attempt to circumvent the appeals system and should be rectified immediately.
- The Bureau does a poor job in its public participation efforts. It merely gives lip service to public involvement and ignores the public's interests.
- There is no economic value in wilderness and all public land should be managed for multiple use.

- BLM should improve one-on-one relations between Bureau field employees and individual ranchers. The Section 8 consultation procedures should be used as a starting point.

- More monies should be allocated for range improvements, especially on-the-ground projects such as reseeding, brush control, water development, and fencing. Areas that don't have completed range EIS's should also get range improvements.

- BLM needs to become more of a leader in rangeland experimentation, particularly for those projects which an individual rancher cannot financially accomplish.

- Too much money is being spent on wildlife. Livestock production must have top priority.

Conservation Interests

- Energy production should be accomplished but not at the expense of environmental degradation.

- BLM needs to reduce political control of the agency by dominant user groups and powerful economic interests.

- There is a need for drastic improvement of the range ecosystem, particularly wildlife, watersheds, and vegetative conditions.

- Protection and production are mutually exclusive objectives only when viewed outside the Bureau's multiple-use, sustained yield mandate.

- Given the complicated land ownership patterns in the West, opportunities for consolidation of land holdings should be sought. BLM should spend funds for acquisition when appropriate.

- The Bureau needs to become more directly visible to the entire spectrum of user/interest groups. This can be accomplished through better publications, multiple-use management education programs, improved recreational opportunities, and uniformed rangers.

- The Bureau needs to improve its public involvement efforts. Re-establishment of effective Multiple-Use Advisory Boards is an important step that can lead to a better balance of voices being heard. Establishment of one-on-one relationships between BLM personnel and key contacts from user groups is also essential.

- Activities such as grazing, wilderness, and recreation would benefit from consummation of the Navajo Exchange.

- The Bureau should attempt to identify all areas with unspoiled natural qualities which represent ecological and geological characteristics that are typical as well as unique.

- ACEC's should be automatically excluded from consideration for coal leasing.

- Due perhaps to some false modern-day romanticism that limits wilderness areas to mountains, we have failed to preserve any of the Great Plains as a wilderness area. The Mescalero Sands is recommended for such a designation.

- The wilderness program should be given a high priority. Periodic reconnaissance of WSA's by BLM will be necessary to prevent violations of the interim management regulations by mining companies.

- In designating an area as wilderness it still holds any energy mineral resources present which can later be exploited if over-riding national interests require it.

- Permits should be required for any new projects which involve significant earth-moving on BLM lands. For projects which will be temporary in duration, such as mineral and mining activities, a rehabilitation plan should be approved and a bond posted, before the permit is granted.

- Wildlife studies are needed to protect the balance of species, including non-game varieties, from development pressures.

- In view of the rapid development of energy-related projects, particularly in the northwestern part of New Mexico, BLM should begin now to expand its staff and develop programs to protect archeological, cultural, and paleontological resources in that area.

- BLM's energy development program needs to address the allocation of regional water supplies, protection of ground water, agricultural land protection, and planned community development.

- Another result of the energy crisis is increased fuel wood gathering on public lands. The BLM should attempt to manage fuel wood species on a maximum-sustained-yield basis. Where local communities are dependent upon fuel wood, harvesting for personal use should be given priority over commercial operations.

- The BLM needs a public outreach program. Areas of potential controversy, such as grazing management, should be explained at public workshops. Using grazing management as one example, attempts should be made to explain how range carrying capacity is determined, how over-grazing is determined, what the characteristics of healthy range are, and what the consequences of over-grazing are. This needs to be done not just in ranching communities, but also in more populated areas, such as Albuquerque.

Energy Interests
(Including Utilities)

- The greatest issue affecting the management of public lands will be the increased demand for the vast energy resources on public lands. Traditional policies governing the use of public lands will have to be re-evaluated if we are to have orderly development of energy resources.

- The long study times mandated by the Wilderness Act, FLPMA, and the BLM Coal Management Program will frustrate and inhibit needed energy development.

- There must be better coordination between government land-use programs and recent enactments calling for shifts from oil and natural gas to coal.

- The wilderness inventory, study, and recommendation process creates a *de facto* withdrawal of proposed wilderness areas during a lengthy study phase.

- In applying interim management to wilderness study areas, BLM should recognize that energy resources are not subservient to wilderness values. BLM should encourage development and alternate use of energy resources during the study phase.

- BLM should accelerate the entire wilderness study process. Emergency accelerated study should be provided where a proposed or existing energy project requires resolution of wilderness proposals that may affect its operation. State agencies should assist in these emergency situations.

- BLM should commence its review of suitable rights-of-way corridors.

- BLM should move for and support a generic coal-lease exchange bill that will facilitate the exchange of leases where there is a bona-fide conflict between development and other concerns.

- The coal leasing unsuitability criteria should never be considered as a means of permanent withdrawal, but rather as a reservation of unsuitable lands for the time being.

- BLM should strive to educate the public in an objective, non-partisan manner about the issues surrounding land-use management decisions.

- BLM expenditures for the wildlife and wilderness programs should emphasize habitat management, transplantation of threatened and endangered species, mitigation of possible adverse effects, and review of threatened and endangered species habitat and possible wilderness areas in order to return the maximum acreage possible to multiple-use management.

- Maximum expenditure should be planned for multiple-use planning to provide for early completion of land use plans and EIS's to consider needed energy developments.

- More efficient leasing of coal and more speedy development of new energy minerals extraction programs should receive substantial emphasis.

- Coal leasing unsuitability-criteria processing should also consider what scale and configuration of lease tract is needed to encourage competitive bidding and mining.

- BLM should evaluate the leasing and mining of a coal property in one combined environmental assessment.

- BLM leasing decisions must take into account such key factors as the potential for effective surface-mined land reclamation, air and water quality, replenishment of surface and ground water, and impacts on the residents, infrastructure, and budgets of communities in the vicinity of energy mineral developments.

- BLM's monopolistic control of many energy resources is preventing the free enterprise system from achieving America's goal of energy independence.

- There is a lack of minerals expertise within BLM. In order to retain qualified staff, incentives such as higher grade levels and access to outside practice should be made available.

- The availability of water will be a key factor in the siting of energy facilities.
- Land exchanges between BLM and private groups have considerable potential to minimize or avoid conflicts associated with energy development.
- While the creation of a Non-Bureau Energy Initiative (NBEI) team in the BLM New Mexico State Office is a significant step, much more needs to be done in order to speed up processing of energy projects.
- A myriad of regulations impede BLM's ability to process energy projects in a timely manner.
- Over 241,807 acres of public lands in New Mexico and Arizona have been withdrawn from mining entry for more than 19 years. Forty percent of the nation's known uranium reserves are located on these withdrawn lands. This area should be opened to mineral locating and mining as quickly as possible in view of the growing concern over insufficient domestic uranium supplies.

Non-Energy Mineral Interests

- Certain rules governing potash leasing have not been finalized by the U.S. Geological Survey. This further adds to the confusion and delay in new BLM mineral projects.
- BLM should expedite withdrawal review pursuant to FLPMA in order to remove unjustified restrictions on mineral exploration and development.

Recreation Interests

- The quota system for permits to run the Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River (which BLM has put forward to prevent over-use) may prevent opportunities for Boy Scout and similar non-commercial expeditions.
- ORV's provide recreation for many people. Therefore, ways must be found to accommodate ORV's without sacrificing the integrity of the natural environment.
- ORV users feel that the only legitimate and realistic management principle is multiple use. Therefore, they disagree with the wilderness study process.
- Presently, there is a lack of supervision and management of cave resources. Caving groups have voiced concern about this, and relations with them are deteriorating.
- Recreation management involves the majority of the users of public lands but is represented by a small percentage of the BLM budget. BLM appears to be drifting away from multiple-use management to single-use management.

Historical and Cultural Preservation Interests

- There is a wealth of paleontological, archeological, historical, prehistorical, and cultural evidence about our past on public lands in New Mexico. Inventory, evaluation, and management of these heritage re-

sources, while mandated by legislation, have never evolved as a Bureau priority. The rapidly expanding development of energy resources, in particular, is a major threat to heritage resources. While many in the scientific community recognize the significance of these resources, the Bureau is not in a position to adequately protect them.

- Interpretative education programs for the general public are needed in order to develop a wider understanding of important heritage resource values and greater support for their preservation.

Other Public Interests

- The process which BLM is utilizing to determine ownership eligibility under color-of-title for over 1,000 public land tracts along the Rio Grande River, which are currently occupied or being farmed in trespass, is not moving fast enough. This frustrates affected citizens. Other remedies including sales, leases, and possible removal will also be difficult to accomplish expeditiously. The Bureau's efforts to resolve this problem have been characterized as "insensitive" and "medieval."

- Widespread public attention has been given to the legality of the current segregation and possible future withdrawal of BLM land near Carlsbad for the Department of Energy's proposed nuclear Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Questions have been raised whether the oil, gas, and potash resources should be sacrificed for the project and whether the environmental impacts are acceptable.

- The restrictions placed on public lands under wilderness review and their designation as wilderness areas are discriminatory against Senior Citizens and the Handicapped.

- The "Sagebrush Rebellion" is the most significant issue facing BLM.

- BLM environmental standards and wilderness-review procedures may have to be flexible to allow for emergency development of energy resources.

Oregon

State Government

- Reduce amount of time to process geothermal leases
- Continue wise use of herbicides
- Need prompt wilderness decisions
- Increase priority of Oregon OCS for oil and gas leasing
- Use wood residue as a source of energy

Local Governments

- Planning process needs to identify more clearly over time the goals being sought

- Enhance renewable resources to optimum levels
- In setting goals, and implementing plans to achieve goals, there needs to be as full integration as possible in resource management of all land owners within management areas
- Secure adequate funding to implement management plans
- Wilderness review should continue on to earliest completion, with recommendations going forward to Congress as appropriate
- There is a need to be flexible in solving or responding to issues or problems
- Reward the user who does a good job of management
- Dominant-use theory should apply in some cases
- Do not lock resources up
- The resource manager has a basic education responsibility to the public

Agricultural Interests

- Support full funding of the Range Improvement Act
- BLM districts should send representatives to monthly meetings of local conservation districts
- Reexamine national memorandum of understanding between BLM, Soil Conservation Service, and Forest Service

Conservation Interests

- Increase funding to manage wildlife habitat, particularly riparian habitat on grazing lands
- Need comprehensive plan for wildlife protection on all islands irrespective of wilderness status
- There should be more emphasis on spotted owl and old growth inventories
- Study the effects of fire on the ecosystems, particularly fire-dependent ecosystems
- Continue funding for wilderness; BLM is trying to do too much in too little time
- More funding for law enforcement and patrol people
- More emphasis on recreation, particularly interpretive maps
- More emphasis and funding for Research Natural Areas
- Consolidate checkerboard ownership in Western Oregon
- Too much emphasis on range and timber specialists

- Concentrate on water quality, soil stability, and native vegetation
- Judicially mandated EIS's should continue to represent the base-line dimension on which the longer-term direction of BLM's program should rest
- Strengthen wildlife-habitat research efforts
- More rapid development of wildlife-habitat guidelines for use of land managers
- Develop regional, state, and district wildlife habitat goals to include species, numbers, and diversity
- Too much of BLM's growth has gone into red tape rather than increasing on the ground management
- Livestock management should fit site characteristics for vegetation productivity
- BLM should more seriously approach the non-profit pollution control legislated by section 208 of the Water Quality Act
- Speedy implementation of the ACEC and special areas programs
- Remove off-road vehicle use from all public lands
- Tighten control of energy exploration leases
- Payments in lieu of taxes should be based on a proportion of income from land uses

Recreation Interests

- Increased funding for education on litter, rights-of-way, and rules of outings
- Oppose closing of trails and ways, if not for specific purposes
- Provide funding for dispersed recreation areas
- Provide funding for intensive management of high-use recreation activities
- Provide enough maintenance of roads to prevent people from having to go off the road to avoid obstructions; road agreements should reserve easements for the public

Timber Interests

- Provide intensive management of timber lands including the use of new techniques
- Continue funding of the FIR project
- There is too much planning

Utah

National Legislative Representatives

- BLM needs to involve ranchers more in making grazing decisions.
- BLM needs more emphasis on public relations to let the public know what and why actions are being taken. Most complaints to congressional offices are the result of basic misunderstandings of BLM management policies.
- BLM needs to demonstrate that it can operate effectively, make decisions, and do the job that needs to be done to manage public lands.

State Government

- A major goal of BLM should be to increase the productivity of public grazing lands. More monies should be allocated for range improvement, especially "on-the-ground" projects such as reseeding, brush control, water development, and fencing.
- Wilderness studies should be accelerated to enable current planning of future uses on public lands. BLM should request assistance from the State in establishing priorities for accelerating wilderness studies.
- BLM should assure that adequate manpower is available to develop energy and mineral EIS's to prevent delays in implementing needed projects.
- BLM should coordinate its program planning with the State's planning and budgeting process. This coordination should focus on the formation of an "investment strategy" to bring the optimum return from government expenditures in Utah.
- The planning process to provide transmission and transportation corridors should be completed.
- The leasing of energy and non-energy minerals should be expedited.
- The requirements of wildlife-habitat management should be emphasized in all BLM decisions.
- More wild horses should be removed. They are destroying the range resource.

Local Governments

- In-lieu payments to counties should be included in BLM's authorization request.
- BLM should be more responsive to local needs and show the public it can make decisions and do the job that needs to be done.

Agricultural Interests

- Cannot assimilate all the information that Federal agencies send out for review and recommendation. Most of the material is too technical for the average rancher, particularly grazing EIS's.

- BLM is increasing allocation of wildlife AUM's at the expense of livestock in grazing EIS's. This isn't fair since wildlife have already been provided for in the past.
- BLM should make more on-the-ground range improvements. Areas that do not have completed grazing EIS's should also get range improvements.
- There is no economic value in wilderness and all public land should be managed for multiple use.
- BLM should continue to emphasize the cadastral survey program to establish legal ownership boundaries.
- BLM should do more to control ORV use because of the damage that is occurring to the range and range improvements.

Energy Interests
(Including Utilities)

- The greatest issue affecting the management of public lands will be the increased demand for the vast energy resources on public lands. Traditional policies governing the use of public lands will have to be re-evaluated if we are to have orderly development of energy resources.
- The long study times mandated by the Wilderness Act, FLPMA, and the BLM Coal Management Program will frustrate and inhibit needed energy development.
- There must be better coordination between government land-use programs and recent enactments calling for shifts from oil and natural gas to coal.
- The wilderness inventory, study, and recommendation process creates a *de facto* withdrawal of proposed wilderness areas during a lengthy study phase.
- There should be a process whereby Congress can change wilderness designations if conditions change. We can no longer afford absolutes in terms of vast public lands withdrawals.
- In applying interim management to wilderness study areas, BLM should recognize that energy resources are not subservient to wilderness values. BLM should encourage development and alternate use of energy resources during the study phase.
- BLM should accelerate the entire wilderness study process. Emergency accelerated study should be provided where a proposed or existing energy project requires resolution of wilderness proposals that may affect its operation. State agencies should assist in these emergency situations.
- BLM should commence its review of suitable rights-of-way corridors.
- BLM should move for and support a generic coal-lease exchange bill that will facilitate the exchange of leases where there is a bona-fide conflict between development and other concerns.
- The coal unsuitability program should never be considered as a means of permanent withdrawal, but rather as a reservation of unsuitable lands for the time being.

- BLM should strive to educate the public in an objective, non-partisan manner about the issues surrounding land-use management decisions.
- Coal leasing should be expanded beyond emphasis on PRLA's.
- More efficient leasing of coal, oil shale, tar sands, and uranium, and more speedy development of new energy minerals extraction programs should receive substantial emphasis.
- BLM expenditures for the wildlife and wilderness programs should emphasize habitat management, transplantation of threatened and endangered species, mitigation of possible adverse effects, and review of threatened and endangered species habitat and possible wilderness areas in order to return the maximum acreage possible to multiple-use management.
- Maximum expenditure should be planned for multiple-use planning to provide for early completion of land use plans and EIS's to consider needed energy developments.
- Increased funding for the processing of rights-of-way and other realty services will be needed to facilitate the development of energy resources.
- The BLM should request increased funding to support the President's call for increased effort in the development of synthetic fuels.

Non-Energy Minerals

- Greater allocation of funds and resources for patenting, exchanges, rights-of-way determinations, and licensing or approvals for mines and mine-related activities should be given priority. This is particularly true because FLPMA has imposed additional burdens upon BLM staff in the area of lands, realty, and minerals.
- Because of uncertainties relating to FLPMA and possible amendments of the general mining law it is becoming necessary to secure title to mineral resources before planning development. For this reason, higher levels of activity in land and mineral rights acquisition are anticipated and BLM should request funding to meet this increased workload.
- The total funding for lands and minerals should be increased and the proportions of the budget for patent withdrawal and right-of-way activities should be increased. The time and resources devoted to testing the validity of mining claims should be reduced.
- BLM does not have an adequate appraisal staff to handle work on a timely basis. Additional funds to allow contracting some of this appraisal work should be considered.
- FLPMA 603 reviews are creating concern in the mining industry. The uncertainties make it difficult to make firm plans for project development.

Recreation Interests

- Recreation management involves the majority of the users of public lands but is represented by a small percentage of the BLM budget. BLM appears to be drifting away from multiple-use management to single-use management.

- BLM is overly concerned with the interests of livestock operators who are a distinct minority compared to recreation users. Range improvement design and funding should also consider the needs of recreation users.
- ORV users feel they no longer have a voice in BLM management decisions since the multiple-use advisory boards were abolished. They support the re-establishment of the district advisory boards.
- In some cases organized wild horse groups feel they have not been properly informed and/or involved in BLM wild-horse gathering operations.
- Helicopters should not be used to gather wild horses.

Wyoming

State Government

- Range improvements should receive a high priority for funding
- Increased funding for watershed projects with emphasis on improving water quantity and quality from BLM lands
- Increase BLM budget and personnel ceiling in order to manage the following required programs through 1990: (1) the new coal leasing program; (2) FLPMA; and (3) Mineral Leasing Act amendments
- Direct more funds toward range research and the impact of wild horses and burros on range vegetation
- Direct more funds toward information dissemination
- Increase public involvement and state interaction with the BLM planning process

Local Governments

- Social-Economic Impact of Energy Development—Local governments want "phased authorizations" to help control impacts
- Rights-of-way authorization process should be simplified
- Environmental and land reports should not be required for all authorizations
- Regulations are not flexible enough to make prompt decisions
- Survey and application requirements are too costly to legalize existing roads under FLPMA for counties
- BLM's role in multiple-use management is not understood by public and special interest groups
- BLM programs are not understood by the public
- Make land available for urban expansion

- Increase capability to process material sales generated by the energy program and urban expansion
- Lack of follow-up coordination once MFP/RMP's are completed
- Some counties claim Sec. 202 of FLPMA gives their plans precedence over Bureau plans—BLM plans must conform to county plans
- Bureau is not able to respond to requests by industry, local and State governments for development of cooperative efforts to implement MFP/RMP decisions
- General—"too much red tape"

Agricultural Interests

- Insufficient funding to accommodate future AMP implementation requirements
- AMP's developed with insufficient user input
- Preparation time for EIS's is too lengthy—streamline process
- Present procedures for forage allocation unfair to livestock operators—wildlife and wild horses should not receive first consideration
- Increase funding to bring wild-horse populations down to proper management levels
- Livestock industry disagrees with Secretary's policy for controlling predatory animals
- Procedures for disposing of gathered wild horses need to be streamlined
- Questionable need for additional wilderness designations
- Give managers more flexibility to make decisions

Conservation Interests

- Lack of a well defined and understood interim management policy
- Development of alternative wilderness study recommendations is being hampered by lack of ACEC definitions
- Bureau has been unable to allocate sufficient funding and capability to meet withdrawal-review deadlines
- Premium environmental areas need expedited withdrawals for protection from surface disturbance associated with mineral entries
- No mitigation for habitat loss caused by energy development and other surface-disturbance activities
- Impact on wildlife from increased human disturbance and pressure
- Need to allocate water for wildlife use—state does not recognize this as a beneficial use

- BLM needs to disseminate more information so its programs and role in multiple-use management are understood by the public

Energy Interests

- Coal industry questions the Bureau's ability to do prerequisite planning to meet industry development schedules
- Resolving conflicts identified through the planning system will delay some PRLA processing past established deadlines
- Application of unsuitability criteria not understood
- Lack of clear policy and procedures for multi-mineral development and coal exchanges
- Lack of capability to process material sales generated by the energy program to meet energy-development and urban-expansion needs
- Bureau is not able to respond to requests by industry, local and State governments for development of cooperative efforts to implement MFP/RMP decisions
- Questionable need for additional wilderness designations
- Lack of a well defined and understood interim wilderness management policy
- Accelerate wilderness review schedule in order to clear mineral areas as soon as possible

Non-Energy Mineral Interests

- Lack capability to process material sales generated by the energy program to meet urban development needs
- Disagreement with some areas identified for possible wilderness designation
- Simplify procedures
- Dollar limitations on material sales too low in view of current material prices

Recreation Interests

- Program inadequate to properly manage visitor use generated by other activities—need additional funding and personnel
- Premium environmental areas need expedited withdrawals for protection from surface disturbance associated with mineral entries

Timber Interests

- Question need for additional wilderness areas
- Industry wants an increase in the annual timber offering

- More flexibility for field managers to make decisions
- Simplify procedures—many are too complicated for the existing situation

Other Interests

- BLM needs to do a better job of informing the public about its programs and planning decisions
- State of Wyoming can be expected to initiate further general water-rights adjudications affecting both current and future Bureau water use
- State of Wyoming's implementation of its water-rights management system may be detrimental to wildlife
- State of Wyoming does not recognize instream flow as a beneficial use of water

Summary of Review-Draft Comments

In early April, 1980, BLM sent a draft of the Four-Year Authorization to State governments, Federal agencies, and national interest groups for their review. Additionally, most BLM State Directors discussed the Draft with many of the same groups and individuals with whom they had earlier consulted. At the Headquarters level, BLM received 55 formal responses. The following is a brief summary of the comments received as of early June, 1980.

Federal Agencies

Twelve Federal agencies responded. Responses were generally positive but most suggested improvements. Some contained critical comments which were quite pointed. A sample of the comments on the draft document follows.

- We find it to be a rather well done, comprehensive document.
- We would suggest citing erosion control as one of the objectives. In many places, the improvement of range condition is mentioned, but seldom, if ever, is erosion control on these acres mentioned.
- We also believe your planning sequences will result in positive results that will reach agency objectives and public expectations. This project will likely be a long and difficult task as most BLM lands will be undergoing intensive inventory and planning activities. We have laid considerable groundwork for National Forest planning under the National Forest Management Act and will be happy to continue sharing our experiences with you.
- Generally speaking present jobs with some urgency are shown but there is a lack of an analysis of the future and a program for accomplishment.
- There is difference between the agencies in their presentation of policy goals. Specifically, there is a lack of an economic efficiency goal for fire protection. BLM shows a great deal of concern with increased effectiveness and improved technical and operational capability. The report does not address concern that these should be economically efficient measures.

- Several Forest Service Regions have expressed a desire to provide for the interchange of personnel between BLM and the Forest Service for law enforcement purposes. The BLM State Directors have indicated that this would be desirable.

- The Non-Energy Offshore section appears to be a step in the right direction, with prototype leasing and a programmatic EIS in Levels 1 and 2. There is not enough data to indicate how much funding, if any, might be forthcoming to the geological survey in support of studies for use in the EIS preparation.

- While useful as a public document and as a means to educate the Bureau's publics, the volume is not fully adequate as a budget justification. The two goals are probably contradictory. Ideally, a budget document with further differentiation and connection of inputs and outputs, costs and benefits would be prepared, and a separate public summary would provide more of the narrative, etc.

- The document is impressive as a first effort, and the staff should be complemented for its energy and its fast turnaround time.

Interest Groups

More than 20 interest groups replied to the draft document at the national level. Many included extensive suggestions on changes in funding or policy, but the general tone was quite positive in most comments. The comments are sampled below.

- Overall, we agree with the presentation of the issues and the goals outlined in the report.

- It is unclear why the budget does not reflect any funding earmarked for special wildlife management—for example, the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA). Recreational use has increased substantially in the CDCA and this would indicate a need for more personnel to monitor damage, issue permits, enforce existing regulations, etc. As a major program for the Bureau an estimated cost for implementing the CDCA plan should be included.

- Considering the BLM manages 47 million acres of wetlands, the Executive Order 11990 should be included.

- It pretty well covers the major problems and, interestingly enough, serves to point out the source of most of them. As we have told you, centralized policy, directives, and regulation from Washington do not respond to site-specific situations and cause the local people to delay needed action or spend untold resources and human effort shuffling papers. Here lies the 'sagebrush rebellion'.

- We would remind you the policies developed on a state-by-state basis—and stuck together like an unplanned jigsaw puzzle—too often reflect narrow, sectional interests and the exigencies of responding to political pressures.

- We commend you and the Bureau of Land Management on doing an outstanding job of putting together a Four-Year Program which certainly recognizes the important issues, problems and most importantly provides a set of sensible solutions for managing public lands in the critical period of the 1980's.

- BLM has committed itself to an aggressive role in protecting historic and cultural properties. We, therefore, are encouraged to note the level of funding proposed for these activities in the section of the draft report dealing with cultural resources.

Governors and State Agencies

Twenty-five Governors or State agencies also responded. The State responses, including those of most western States, were very positive in tone and suggestion.

- The Department is of the opinion that the regional technical working groups have been effective and is pleased to see that BLM plans to continue this effort. The Environmental Studies Program is a vital element of the 'Four-Year Authorization for the Bureau of Land Management, 1982-1985'.

- There is too much emphasis in the same section of the draft report on leasing issues off the coast of Alaska and California to the exclusion of the North and Mid-Atlantic areas.

- I appreciate the President's effort in attempting to meet ever increasing demands on our public lands from all sectors while simultaneously reducing Federal spending to balance the budget. Across the board budget cuts may seem necessary, but commodity output increases will also help slow the inflation spiral. Programs that increase this output should be strongly supported.

- I want to commend the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management for the generally positive approach to the massive challenge of preparing a Four-Year Authorization.

- I support adequate funding for the BLM to carry out needed resource management mandates. I cannot support project funding requests which are not directly applicable to on-the-ground improvements of the public domain.

- I applaud your approach to providing three alternative funding levels with the Secretary's flexibility of choosing among the three or another level or an appropriate mix.

- This approach is one of the key elements in successfully managing public lands and waters to meet the resource needs of the Nation.

Resource Area Planning Schedules

2

This Appendix includes tables indicating what planning and management activities are projected for FY 1982 through FY 1991 in each of BLM's resource or planning areas. Thus the tables indicate how activities undertaken in the Four-Year Authorization period relate to long-term program implementation. The tables are grouped by the State Office under which the resource areas fall.

The Bureau's planning procedures lead initially to the development of Resource Management Plans (RMP's) which include environmental impact statements; these are land-use plans for determining the appropriate mix of uses for a resource area. Once the RMP is approved, activity planning is undertaken (i.e., planning for implementation of specific programs, such as herd area management for wild horses and burros and cultural resources management). Some activities provided for in the RMP will take little or no activity planning and can be implemented soon after RMP approval. Other activities will require two or more years to develop plans and prepare environmental assessments.

The RMP planning procedures are new. They were developed to implement Section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act; regulations (43 CFR 1600) pertaining to the new procedures were published in the *Federal Register* on August 7, 1979. However, the Bureau is currently in a transition period in implementing the new planning procedures.

Under earlier planning procedures, Management Framework Plans (MFP's) were developed for resource areas or portions of resource areas (planning units). Where development of MFP's was under way at the time the new regulations were adopted, the MFP's will be completed and implemented. The Bureau's planning system is on a 10-year cycle. Five years after a land use plan is approved, it is reviewed to determine if revisions, amendments, or a new plan will be required. The plan must be revised within 10 years of approval. For those areas where MFP's have recently or will shortly be completed, the new planning regulations, leading to development of an RMP, will not be implemented until the next planning cycle. Changes, if needed, will be accommodated through the amendment process.

The development of RMP's, MFP's, and activity-specific environmental statements, indicated in the tables for the early years, are based largely on court mandated environmental statement schedules and the coal program schedule. *The activity planning and implementation schedules are based on general time frames which can be achieved at the level of funding and full-time permanent positions in Level 1.* At Level 1, implementation will begin after approximately two years of activity planning (varying by activity as previously discussed) and will be completed within six years of RMP approval. Implementation would continue until and while the plan is revised. At Levels 2 and 3, implementation would be completed generally from eight years to 10 years or more from RMP approval, respectively.

During the transition to the new RMP procedures, there will be a complex mix of planning activities ongoing in the BLM. Planning activities are being carried out under both old and new procedures, and in many cases planning under the two procedures encompasses different geographical units. Therefore, *activities indicated for each resource area in the following tables give only a general illustration of actual planning and management activities being undertaken in a specific area.* For example, where completions of MFP's are shown, these may be amendments or updates. In addition, an MFP or activity-specific environmental statement shown for a resource area may cover only a portion of the area. Alternately an MFP or environmental state-

ment may cover more than one resource area or parts of several resource areas. (These variations have been shown where possible, but where many complex variations occur, more general information is presented.)

It should be borne in mind that *several management activities are going on in a given area at one time.* Implementation of existing plans does not cease when a revision or new planning cycle is initiated. Existing "on-the-ground" activities will continue until a new or revised plan is approved, at which point implementation and management of "on-the-ground" activities may be revised. An attempt has been made to demonstrate this overlap of implementation and planning, but for a clearer presentation, all management activities are not shown in all years.

Legend for Tables

MPA	**Management Planning Analysis** (identification of issues to determine data needs and focus planning efforts; also, establishment of standards for data collection, alternatives to be examined, and criteria for selecting a preferred alternative)
INV	**Inventory**
U/M	**Unit Resource Analysis/Management Framework Plan** (land use plan under old BLM planning procedures, to be completed, or amended, for some areas during the transition to new planning procedures)
RMP	**Resource Management Plan** (land use plan required by new planning procedures)
AP	**Activity Planning** (planning for implementation of specific programs, including environmental assessments or impact statements, as required)
IMP	**Implementation**
*	**Evaluation** of RMP to determine whether amendment or revision is necessary. An RMP revision is required at least every 10 years.
CEIS	**Coal Environmental Impact Statement**
REIS	**Range or Grazing Environmental Impact Statement**
TEIS	**Timber Environmental Impact Statement**

Alaska

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Lower Yukon	Multiple programs	U/M	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP					
Anvik (portion of Lower Yukon)	Multiple programs		MPA	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP
McGrath (portion of Lower Yukon)	Multiple programs			MPA	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP
Upper Yukon	Multiple programs	MPA	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Yukon-Tanama	Multiple programs	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Arctic-Koyukuk	Minerals, multiple programs	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Northwest	Grazing, minerals, multiple programs	U/M	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP
Southcentral	Multiple Programs	IMP U/M FY 80	IMP								
Denali (portion of Southcentral)	Recreation, minerals, multiple programs	MPA	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Fortymile	Minerals, recreation, wildlife	IMP U/M FY 80	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	IMP
Corridor	Energy, utility transportation corridor	IMP U/M FY 79	IMP	MPA	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP

RMP's will also be developed for Wrangell-St. Elias, Lake Clark, Aniakchak and Noatak National Resource Areas. Management planning analysis is expected to be initiated in at least two of these areas in FY 81, and RMP's for all four are planned to be completed by FY 86 or FY 87. Planning schedules for these areas have not yet been finalized. In addition, should BLM receive management responsibility for the Western Arctic Reserve through Congressional action, an RMP would also be prepared for this area.

Arizona

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Lower Gila North	Range, wilderness	REIS U/M FY 81	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV
Lower Gila South	Range, wilderness	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP		

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Havasu	Recreation, burros	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Gila	Range	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Vermillion	Range, recreation	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Phoenix	Range, lands	INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Yuma	Recreation, burros	MPA	INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP
San Simon	Range, Gila Box	IMP U/M FY 75	MPA	INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	RMP
Shivwits	Range, recreation	IMP U/M FY 79	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Kingman	Range, wilderness	U/M FY 80	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP

California

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Caliente (South Sierra Foothills)	Oil and gas, range, recreation	U/M	REIS	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Caliente (Coast Valley)	Oil and gas, range, recreation	RMP	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP			
Ridgecrest (CD)[1]	Recreation, minerals, lands	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP
Bishop (CD)	Wilderness, wild horses and burros	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP
Bishop (Benton-Owens Valley)	Wilderness, ACEC's, natural areas	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP
Bishop (Bodie-Colville)	Wilderness, ACEC's natural areas, range	REIS/AP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP						
Pit River	Range, wildlife, lands	RMP	RMP	AP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP	IMP

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Eagle Lake (Cal-Nev)	Range, recreation, lands	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP
Eagle Lake (Willow Creek)	Range, recreation, lands	REIS U/M FY 81	AP	AP	IMP						
Eagle Lake (Honey Lake-Beckwourth)	Recreation, lands	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Surprise (Tuledade-Homecamp)	Recreation, wildlife	IMP U/M FY 77	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	IMP
Surprise (Cowhead-Mass)	Range, recreation, wildlife	AP/IMP U/M FY 78	IMP	IMP	IMP						
Siskiyou (Mt. Dome)	Range, lands	AP U/M FY 80	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Siskiyou (Redding)	Range, lands	U/M	REIS	AP/ IMP	IMP						
Four Rivers	Lands, forestry	U/M	REIS	AP/ IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP
Ishi	Range, lands	U/M	REIS	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	INV	RMP
Motherlode	Forestry, lands, recreation	REIS U/M FY 81	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP
Bay Sierra	Recreation, forestry, lands	REIS U/M FY 81	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP
Diablo	Range, recreation, wildlife	RMP	RMP	RMP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
North Coast	Forestry, wilderness, King Range plan implementation	AP U/M FY 79	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Mendocino	Forestry, wilderness	AP U/M FY 79	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	IMP
Clear Lake	Range, recreation	INV U/M	U/M REIS	AP	AP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	INV	RMP
Barstow (CD)	Recreation, wilderness, ACEC's (cultural)	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP
Cima (CD)	Range, wilderness, wild horses and burros	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Indio (CD)	Wildlife, wilderness, recreation	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
El Centro (CD)	Energy and minerals, recreation, wilderness	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
El Centro (E. San Diego Co.)	Lands, wilderness	AP U/M FY 80	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
El Centro (W. San Diego Co.)	Lands, wilderness	U/M	REIS	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	MPA	INV	RMP

CD-California Desert. All resource areas within the California Desert will be a part of the same RMP, to be completed in FY 1990.

Colorado

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Royal Gorge (Raton Basin and Eastern Plains)	Coal	AP U/M FY 81	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA
Royal Gorge (Royal Gorge P.U.)	Range, recreation	U/M	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	RMP
San Luis	Range, wildlife	U/M	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	RMP	AP	AP
Northeast	Recreation, coal, oil and gas	RMP	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Kremmling	Range, coal	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP	IMP
White River	Energy, wilderness	AP U/M FY 81	IMP	IMP/ MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	RMP	AP	AP/ IMP	IMP
Grand Junction	Wilderness, energy	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Glenwood Springs	Coal, recreation, lands, range	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP
San Juan	Cultural, energy, range	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Uncompaghre	Coal, wilderness	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP
Gunnison Basin	Minerals, recreation, wildlife	IMP U/M FY 81	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	RMP	AP

Idaho

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Owyhee	Range	AP U/M FY 79	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Bruneau	Range	REIS	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV
Cascade (Cascade)	Range		MPA	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Cascade (Horseshoe)	Range			MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP
Magic (Twin Falls)	Range	REIS	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV
Raft River (Cassia)	Range	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Bannock - Oneida	Range	AP U/M FY 79	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Big Butte (Big Desert)	Range	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Big Butte (Big Lost-Mackay)	Range	U/M	REIS	AP	AP	IMP					
Medicine Lodge		INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Soda Springs	Range		MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP
Lemhi	Range	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Pahsimeroi	Range	REIS	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV
Challis - Mackay	Range	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP
Challis - Mackay (Mackay Portion)	Range	U/M	REIS	AP	AP	IMP					
Monument	Range	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Bennett Hills	Range	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Bennett Hills (Sun Valley Portion)	Range	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP						
Emerald Empire	Forestry	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP
Cottonwood	Range	REIS	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV

Montana

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Big Dry	Range, coal	REIS U/M FY 81	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Powder River	Range, coal	INV U/M FY 80	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
South Dakota	Range		MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
West River	Coal	U/M FY 80	U/M	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP
East River	Coal	U/M		MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP
Billings	Range, coal	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Judith	Range	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Valley	Range	AP (Coal)	IMP/ MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Phillips	Range	AP (Coal)	AP (Coal)	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Havre	Range	AP (Coal)	AP (Coal)	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP
Dillon	Range	AP U/M FY 79	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP
Garnet	Range, forestry	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Headwaters	Range, energy	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP	IMP

Nevada

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Caliente	Range	AP U/M FY 80	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Tonopah	Range	AP U/M FY 79	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Paradise - Denio	Range	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP
Sonoma - Gerlach	Range	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP
Clark	Range	REIS U/M FY 80	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Schell	Range	REIS U/M FY 80	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV
Reno	Range	REIS U/M FY 80	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV
Wells	Range	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP	IMP
Egan	Range	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Shoshone - Eureka	Range	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Lanotan	Range	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Elko	Range	INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Esmeralda	Range	INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Walker	Range		MPA	INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP

New Mexico

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Oklahoma	Coal, oil and gas, lands	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	MPA	MPA/ INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP
Rio Puerco	Range, watershed, multiple programs	MPA/ INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Taos	Range, lands, multiple programs	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Farmington	Range, coal, multiple programs	MPA U/M FY 81	CEIS/ MPA	MPA/ INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP
San Augustine	Forestry, range, wilderness, wildlife, coal, cultural	REIS U/M FY 81	AP/ IMP/ INV	AP/ INV/ IMP	U/M/ MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP
Jornado	Range, lands, coal, recreation, wilderness	U/M	U/M/ MPA	U/M/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP
Las Cruces - Lordsburg	Range, wildlife, wildnerness, recreation	INV U/M FY 80	RMP	RMP	AP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
White Sands	Range, wildlife, wilderness, recreation	U/M U/M FY 80	REIS	AP	AP/ IMP	MPA/ IMP	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP/ IMP

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Roswell	Range, wildlife, multiple programs	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Carlsbad	Range, wildlife, multiple programs	AP/ IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	INV/ RMP	RMP	RMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP

Oregon

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Warmer Lakes	Range	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP
High Desert	Range	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Lost River	Range	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Riley	Range	REIS U/M FY 81	AP	AP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP
Andrews	Range	REIS U/M FY 81	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
John Day	Range	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Northern Malheur	Range	AP U/M FY 80	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Southern Malheur	Range	U/M	REIS	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Central Oregon - Deschutes	Range	REIS U/M FY 81	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Central Oregon - Deschutes	Range	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Baker	Range	AP U/M FY 80	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Grande Ronde	Range		MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Basin Border	Range	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Tillamook-Yamhill-Alsea	Forestry	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Clackamas-Santiam	Forestry	AP U/M FY 80	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Mohawk-Dorena	Forestry	TEIS U/M FY 81	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Lorane-Noti	Forestry	TEIS U/M FY 81	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
North Umpqua-Drain-Dillard-South Umpqua	Forestry	TEIS U/M FY 81	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Butte Falls-Klamath	Range, forestry	U/M	REIS	AP	AP	IMP/ MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP
Rogue River-Grants Pass	Range, forestry	U/M	REIS	AP	AP	IMP/ MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP
Galice-Glendale	Forestry	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP
Smith Umpque-Loon Lake-Coos River-Burnt Mountain-Myrtlewood	Forestry	AP U/M FY 79	IMP	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP

Utah

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Kanab	Range, wilderness, coal	INV/AP U/M FY 80	U/M/ IMP	AP/ IMP/ REIS	AP/ IMP/ MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP
Escalante	Range, wilderness, coal	AP U/M FY 80	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Beaver River	Range, coal	REIS/ INV/ U/M FY 81	U/M/ AP	REIS/ AP	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP/ MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Price River	Range, wilderness, coal	AP U/M FY 80	AP	CEIS/ IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Grand	Range, wilderness, coal	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP	IMP
Sevier River	Range, coal	CEIS U/M FY 80	AP	AP/ CEIS/ MPA	IMP/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP
Henry Mountain	Range, wilderness, coal	REIS/ IMP U/M FY 81	AP/ IMP	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Pony Express	Range	U/M/ INV	REIS/ INV	U/M/ AP	REIS/ AP	MPA/ INV	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Diamond Mountain	Range	AP/IMP U/M FY 80	AP/ IMP	IMP	IMP/ MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
House Range	Range	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Book Cliffs	Range, wilderness	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
San Juan	Range, wilderness	MPA U/M FY 80	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Bear River	Range	MPA/ INV	U/M/ INV	U/M/ INV	REIS/ U/M	REIS/ AP	AP/ MPA	IMP/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP
Dixie	Range	INV/ IMP	U/M	REIS/ MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP
Warm Springs	Range, wilderness		MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP
San Rafael	Range, wilderness, coal			MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP

Wyoming

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Grass Creek	Range, wilderness, coal	AP U/M FY 81	AP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Washakie	Range	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Cody	Range			MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP
Divide	Coal, range, wilderness	U/M U/M FY 79	REIS/ CEIS/ IMP	AP/ IMP/ MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP
Overland	Coal, range, wilderness	U/M	REIS/ CEIS	AP	IMP/ MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP
Lander-Green Mountain	Range	AP U/M FY 79	IMP	IMP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Lander-Over-the-Rim	Coal	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP			
Medicine Bow	Range, coal		MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP
Big Sandy	Coal, range, wilderness	U/M FY 80	CEIS	AP	IMP	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP
Salt Wells	Coal, range, wilderness	AP U/M FY 80	AP/ CEIS	IMP/ MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	IMP	IMP	AP
Kemmerer	Range, wilderness, coal	INV U/M FY 81	CEIS/ INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP
Pinedale	Range, wilderness		MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP

Resource Planning Areas	Program Thrusts	FY 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Platte River		INV	CEIS/ RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*	IMP	IMP
Buffalo		CEIS/ MPA	CEIS/ INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP	IMP*
Newcastle-Wyoming Counties	Range	AP U/M FY 80	MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP	IMP
Newcastle-Kansas and Nebraska				MPA	INV	INV	RMP	RMP	AP	AP	IMP

Audits and Evaluations

This appendix presents a summary of completed audits and evaluations of BLM programs which have been conducted internally and by the Department of the Interior, the General Accounting Office, Congressional Committees and the National Academy of Sciences. The subjects of the summarized reports are in many cases discussed in the issue portions of the program narratives contained in Chapter 4.

Each of the following summaries indicates the organization which performed the audit or evaluation, the title and date of the report, the major findings and recommendations of the report, and actions taken by the Bureau in response to the findings and recommendations.

Energy and Minerals Management

ONSHORE ENERGY-COAL

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Issues Facing the Future of Federal Leasing,* June 25, 1979.

Major Findings The report identified six overriding questions which the Comptroller General reported to Congress as necessary for "understanding the broad range of coal leasing issues." These questions cover

- balancing coal leasing with interrelated and conflicting national objectives;
- interactions between the Departments of Energy and Interior;
- production potential of coal already under lease;
- coal availability and ongoing land use planning and coal exploration;
- identification, evaluation, selection, and sale of specific tracts;
- improvement in timely and orderly development of leases.

Subsequent Action None, pending General Accounting Office report on the Federal coal leasing program.

ONSHORE ENERGY OTHER THAN COAL (Oil and Gas)

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Simultaneous Filings,* April 13, 1979.

Major Findings While GAO found some procedures which might make it possible, it reported no fraudulent manipulations of the simultaneous drawings.

Subsequent Action Revisions in the simultaneous leasing system are being implemented to reduce the potential for abuses. See Chapter Four: Onshore Energy Other than Coal.

NON-ENERGY MINERALS (ONSHORE)

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Legal and Administrative Obstacles to Extracting Other Minerals from Oil Shale,* September 1979.

Major Findings

- Most of the oil shale in Colorado's Piceance Creek Basin is intermingled with sodium and aluminous minerals.
- Present mining and mineral leasing laws for the development of low-grade and intermingled minerals are open to varying interpretations which delay multi-mineral development decisions.
- An unequivocal statement of Congressional interest in optimal mineral recovery and streamlined development is essential.

Subsequent Action Under Secretary James Joseph responded in a letter of November 27, 1979. The letter set forth a view that the legal administrative obstacles were not as preclusive as the GAO report implied. On the major recommendation that the Departments of the Interior and Energy detail a policy of optimum recovery of all minerals in oil shale development, the letter stated that an Interior Departmental Petroleum Imports Reduction Task Force agreed with GAO on the importance of sodium development and implied that it would consider combined use if the Department of the Interior studied the feasibility of extending oil shale prototype leasing.

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Impact of Mining Law Reform on Hardrock Mineral Availability,* February 1979.

Major Findings

- Mining Law is obsolete.
- There is a need for a new mining law better meshed with FLPMA.
- Hardrock leasing system poses several problems.
- The issuance of patents confined to the mineral estate could accommodate FLPMA.

Subsequent Action Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Budget, and Administration Larry Mierotto responded to a draft of this report by letter on December 30, 1978. The letter made these points:

- agreed with GAO that added control of mineral exploration and production was needed to protect the environment;
- agreed with GAO on the need to get fair market value for hardrock minerals;
- pointed out that the key issue in mining law reform is the amount of discretion the Secretary of the Interior needs to harmonize mining with other land-use responsibilities;
- noted that the GAO recommendation for issuing patents for the mineral estate only did not, at least as spelled out, meet four criteria of President Carter's Environmental Message which outlined mining law reform in terms of: (1) mineral leasing; (2) explicit discretion for the Secretary of the Interior; (3) prior approval of mining and mined land rehabilitation plans; (4) and integration of mining activity with multiple-use planning and management.

OFFSHORE ENERGY

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Georgia Embayment—Illustrating Again the Need for More Data Before Selecting and Leasing Outer Continental Shelf Lands,* March 19, 1979.

Major Findings GAO review indicated that the data available to select and value tracts was limited. The degree of industry interest was significantly less than in prior sales due to the fact that the area was believed to have limited geological potential. This sale might not have been held at this time had more information been available.

A significant aspect of this sale was the experimental use of a sliding scale royalty bidding system. According to GAO, the new bidding system has potential for helping to assure that the public receives a fair market value return for OCS resources.

Subsequent Action DOI pointed out that GAO does not define "fair" market value and that DOI's recent analysis of the criteria used in bid decisions showed that current procedures result in "levels of bid rejections that approximate the optimal from the viewpoint of public receipts."

DOI stated that it will continue to work with the Department of Energy to identify potential benefits to national energy policy from improved information concerning OCS resources.

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *OCS Leasing Program and the Role of Resource Reports,* February 1979.

Major Findings The report recommended that BLM improve the quality and utility of its OCS Resource Reports.

Subsequent Action BLM is complying with the report's recommendations by:

- Clearly informing Federal agencies preparing Resource Reports of the role and importance of the Reports, of why the information is needed, and of how it will be used;
- Tailoring requests for Resource Reports to each individual agency by requesting information specific to its expertise;
- Providing feedback to cooperating agencies on how the Resource Report information was used in the OCS leasing process.

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Lower Cook Inlet—Another Example of More Data Needed for Appraising Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Resources,* June 8, 1978.

Major Findings The Department of the Interior selected and evaluated Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas tracts for leasing without obtaining enough information to determine their potential resources. This encourages industry to tie up capital in lands with minimum or no resource potential or to buy lands for less than fair market value. To prevent this, the leasing program should be designed to offer the best acreage after it has been adequately explored for resources.

Subsequent Action Interior supports GAO's concept of prelease exploration but it rejects GAO's specific recommendations for carrying out such a program. Interior said, "It is particularly important, in our view, that the development of a prelease exploration program be based upon careful study of the issues and the development of criteria."

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Outer Continental Shelf Sale #35 — Problem Selection and Evaluating Land to Lease*, March 7, 1977.

Major Findings OCS tracts were selected without obtaining adequate information to determine their potential resources. This, plus pressure to lease a predetermined number of acres, resulted in:

- selecting tracts which the Department believed had little potential for development,
- deriving unreliable tract values based on inadequate data, and
- overestimating revenues for budget purposes by five times the actual revenues received, because of inadequate information and overly optimistic estimates.

Subsequent Action The Secretary and the Director, Office of Management and Budget, expressed concern with the cost of obtaining additional data and believed GAO had not presented the cost effectiveness of a systematic exploration program.

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Outer Continental Shelf Sale #40—Inadequate Data Used to Select and Evaluate Lands to Lease*, June 28, 1977.

Major Findings The Department of the Interior's policy of leasing Outer Continental Shelf lands that have not been properly evaluated (because of insufficient data) encourages industry to speculate in lands believed to contain no or minimal resources and does not guarantee market value for the leased resources.

Subsequent Action Interior official told GAO that the Department's views on the recommendations in the Sale 35 report as stated in the June 13, 1977, letter from Under Secretary of the Interior to Chairman Ribicoff, Senate Committee on Government Operations, could be considered representative of their views on GAO's recommendations in this report. (See Subsequent Action, *OCS Sale #35.*)

Organization Bureau of Land Management.

Title and Date *New Orleans, New York, Pacific, and Alaska OCS Offices, Evaluation Reports*, 1977.

Major Findings Reports studied the managerial effectiveness of the offices to provide input to an overall assessment of the OCS program. Issues identified which relate to the program as a whole were:

- Employees feel that EIS quality standards are often changed by the Department on short notice causing frustration and disillusionment.
- There are strong indications that the Environmental Studies Program is mostly oriented to baseline studies while slighting current management information needs.
- Multiple-use management: There are resources on the OCS other than minerals (e.g. cultural resources) which are being stolen or otherwise destroyed in the absence of management by any agency.
- The standardization of organization structure and role definition for OCS offices are concerns, as are a Public Affairs Plan for the OCS program and Geological Survey/BLM coordination.

Subsequent Action Standard organizational structures were established for all OCS offices, and the Washington office OCS structure has been completely reorganized. Liaison with Public Affairs and Geological Survey has been intensified, and the Environmental Studies Program has been completely revised.

Organization Appropriations Committee Investigative Study on the OCS Environmental Studies Program.

Title and Date *A Report to the Committee on Appropriations U.S. House of Representatives on the Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Studies Program,* March 1979.

Major Findings The Report notes the extensive evaluation of the studies program that has been carried out by BLM during the last year and concludes that the revised program will improve BLM's OCS activities.

Subsequent Action As stated in the Secretary's May 7, 1979, letter to Chairman Yates, House Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies: "Having accomplished this first effort to revise the studies program we do not intend to have it remain static. We will, instead, continue to review the program in light of changing needs and conditions."

Organization National Academy of Sciences.

Title and Date *OCS Oil and Gas: An Assessment of the Department of the Interior Environmental Studies Program,* December 1977.

Major Findings NAS found that "the program has not been based on an adequate assessment and identification of the scientific research that is required to answer environmental concerns for oil and gas operations," and that the program does not contribute effectively to leasing decisions or to the collection of good scientific information necessary for OCS management, both offshore and onshore.

Subsequent Action The findings and recommendations of the evaluation formed the basis for the publication of *Study Design for Resource Management Decisions: OCS Oil and Gas Development and the Environment*, October 1, 1978, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management—a revision of the program design for the OCS Environmental Studies Program.

Renewable Resource Management

WILD HORSE AND BURRO MANAGEMENT

Organization Bureau of Land Management.

Title and Date *Adopt-A-Horse Review*, September 29, 1978.

Major Findings A review of selected adoptors of large numbers of animals in California, Oregon, Colorado, Minnesota, Missouri, and Oklahoma revealed that the animals inspected appeared to be in good condition. No indications of mistreatment or inhumane care were observed. In three instances, however, the inspecting team was unable to locate some animals or the adoptors. Law enforcement personnel are investigating these cases.

Interviews and research indicated that there are problems associated with the internal operation of the program. Lack of adequate staff and a low level of management attention have made operation of the program difficult in some States.

Subsequent Action In fiscal year 1979, a Division of Wild Horses and Burros was established and staffed in the Washington office to strengthen and provide leadership for the program. Also, more stringent requirements for qualifying as adoptors were established.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Small Business Set-Aside Sales in Western Oregon*, April 1979.

Major Findings GAO found that set-aside sales were of higher quality than open sales yet returned less revenue.

Subsequent Action In reviewing the report, BLM discovered that the GAO compared set-aside sales with all types of sales. When BLM compared set-aside sales to open sales from which the set asides are chosen, there was no discrepancy. There have been, therefore, no changes in policy or practice.

Recreation and Environmental Areas

RECREATION MANAGEMENT

Organization Bureau of Land Management.

Title and Date *Recreation Management Program Analysis*, October 11, 1979.

Major Findings BLM's Recreation Management Program is a paradoxical combination of great opportunities and serious problems. Opportunities lie not only in the recreational resources on public lands and their potential for satisfying soaring public demand, but also in helping BLM build the kind of broad public support necessary to accomplish its overall mission of multiple-use management. Problems center around a historic lack of management emphasis, weak program development, and grossly inadequate funding. These problems are closely interrelated and must be dealt with comprehensively in any realistic strategy for program revitalization.

Subsequent Action A major program development effort is currently under way for the Recreation Management program.

Lands and Realty Management

LANDS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Organization Department of the Interior, Office of the Inspector General.

Title and Date *Recovery of Costs Incurred by the Bureau of Land Management in Processing Rights-of-Way Across Federal Lands*, November 1978.

Major Findings The report identified several problems in accounting for and collecting amounts due from right-of-way applicants including

- inadequate accounting controls to capture and bill all costs properly reimbursable,
- inappropriate indirect costs allocated to the work, and
- no effective procedures to insure timely payments or assess interest penalties on overdue amounts.

Subsequent Action BLM took action to implement recommended improvements in costs recovery procedures. New procedural regulations were published in proposed form on October 9, 1979. Final regulations will be published in the spring of 1980.

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Land Title Should Be Conveyed to Alaska Natives Faster*, June 1978.

Major Findings Six years after passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the report identified an urgent need to accelerate land title transfer to Alaska Native corporations so they can develop the lands' natural resources to generate income. The report made several recommendations to prevent further delays.

Subsequent Action BLM has increased the rate of land transfer to Natives.

Technical Support and Administrative Services

CADASTRAL SURVEY

Organization House Appropriation Committee's Survey and Investigation Staff.

Title and Date *A Report to the House Committee on Appropriation's Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies: Cadastral Survey Program of the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Forest Service,* February 1979.

Major Findings The BLM Cadastral Survey Program is inadequate to meet the needs of resource managers within BLM and other agencies, according to the report. The report indicated that the problems could not be solved unless the Cadastral Survey were given higher priority within BLM.

Subsequent Action BLM responded to the report, indicating that the problem was not one of priority, but of inadequate manpower and funding for BLM. However, BLM initiated its Task Force to explore ways to improve response to survey needs and took several interim measures, including reallocating positions to Cadastral Survey and developing procedures for long-range planning with NPS and delegating survey authority to FS.

Organization Bureau of Land Management.

Title and Date *Cadastral Survey Program Support Paper,* January 5, 1979.

Major Findings The report identified a lack of an adequate number of professional cadastral surveyors, travel ceiling limitations, a hectic schedule because of unplanned-for survey requests, and a lack of long-term funding commitments as major sources of difficulty for the program.

Subsequent Action Action has been taken to improve long-range planning. Progress is being made toward delegating cadastral survey tasks to other agencies. Sixteen positions have been reallocated to Cadastral Survey to increase productivity.

Organization Department of the Interior, Office of Audit and Investigation.

Title and Date *Review of the Reimbursable Program, Office of Cadastral Survey, Denver Service Center,* November 24, 1978.

Major Findings A review of reimbursable surveys conducted out of the

Denver Service Center found a huge backlog of requests, unwillingness or insufficient funds from other agencies to complete work started in the past but not completed, and inability on the part of BLM to monitor survey costs effectively.

Subsequent Action See other Cadastral Survey evaluation descriptions.

Organization Department of the Interior.

Title and Date *Status Report—Department of the Interior Surveying and Mapping Study Team,* August 1978.

Major Findings The report found problems of both quality and quantity with Cadastral Survey Program staffing and found shortcomings in survey performance methods. It recommended the establishment of a strong survey unit in the Department to oversee and control cadastral survey and land records.

Subsequent Action None.

Organization Department of the Interior, Office of Audit and Investigation.

Title and Date *Interim Report on the Cadastral Survey Program,* April 1978.

Major Findings The primary recommendation of this report, which studied the conflict between the National Park Service and BLM over which agency should execute boundary surveys, was that a Memorandum of Understanding between BLM and the National Park Service be developed.

Subsequent Action A Memorandum of Understanding was prepared and agreed to by Park Service staff and Cadastral Survey but has not received final approval.

Organization Bureau of Land Management.

Title and Date *Experimental Cadastral Survey Contract, Colorado,* April 1974.

Major Findings The contracted survey was more costly but of the same quality as if it had been done by BLM. Contracting for surveys is a viable alternative.

Subsequent Action Contract surveys are used for original surveys but have been found to be less satisfactory for resurvey or special surveys.

Organization Bureau of Land Management.

Title and Date *Review of the Cadastral Survey Program,* April 1980.

Major Findings The study, performed in response to the House Appropriation Committee Survey and Investigation Staff's report on the Cadastral

Survey Program, identified a number of major needs including:

- a clearer definition of mission, which establishes basic policies to accomplish program objectives and enables BLM to be more responsive to other agencies' needs,
- resources consistent with its responsibilities,
- a system for setting survey priorities,
- expanded delegation of work to other competent surveyors, and
- a clarification of authority to permit other Federal agencies with survey capabilities to carry out survey work.

In addition, the Cadastral Survey Program must be modernized and its technical, operating, and manual guidelines must be maintained to reflect current accepted survey standards and operational practices.

Subsequent Action The Bureau is currently formulating an action plan that addresses the study's findings and incorporates its recommendations.

DATA MANAGEMENT

Organization Department of the Interior, Office of the Inspector General.

Title and Date *Review of the Bureau of Land Management's Mining Claim Recordation System Data Entry and Retrieval Procedures*, November 28, 1979.

Major Findings OIG found a significant number of discrepancies between the spelling of claimants' names filed in the computer and the coded source documents in the mining claim case file. The number of records containing discrepancies ranged from 69 to 86 percent in samples in the computer of three States. No errors were found on the "critical" elements such as serial number.

OIG also found that access to the data in the computer was virtually uncontrolled. Although user numbers, passwords, or special authorization codes were available, their use was not enforced. It also found that mining claim documents filed by claimants at the State Offices are inadequately controlled against loss or theft.

Subsequent Action The Denver Service Center has recommended to the Washington Office that a Mining Claim Workshop be held in the spring, 1980, to cover issues raised in the evaluation. Also edit programs have been developed to prevent a majority of the errors from recurring and an error listing will be provided to offices entering data for purposes of making corrections. Instructions have been issued to State Offices to exercise greater control over the use of passwords and access and security procedures.

Organization Department of the Interior, Office of the Inspector General.

Title and Date *Review of ADP Operations in the BLM Denver Service Center*, May 1978.

Major Findings

- Management of hardware maintenance needs improvement.
- There are no full-time security officers.
- Physical security needs improvement.
- The ADP Division does not have complete and current standard operating procedures.
- The application software development system magnetic tapes and system access codes need control.
- Privacy Act implementation needs improvement.

Subsequent Action In response to the findings of the report, BLM has taken the following actions:

- Installed a Honeywell 66/80 which provides the software to monitor and record all hardware failures;
- Spread Security Officer duties among personnel from several branches and assigned responsibility for security to the Chief of Data Processing;
- Established an organizational unit under the Chief of Data Processing to develop standard operating procedures;
- Reorganized the Applications Branch to provide a separate team responsible for application maintenance;
- Identified data which need to be controlled under the Privacy Act through periodic maintenance checks;
- Altered procedures to insure that all tapes are sent through the Tape Librarian;
- Designed Inventory controls for comprehensive accounting.

FIRE MANAGEMENT

Organization Bureau of Land Management.

Title and Date *Interagency and Regional Fire Operations Evaluation*, June 30, 1978.

Major Findings The evaluation examined the effectiveness of the interagency and regional concept in firefighting operations and its impact on wildfire programs in the Western States excluding Alaska, focusing on the Boise Interagency Fire Center, the Susanville Interagency Dispatch Center, and Western Slope Fire Operations in Grand Junction, Colorado.

The report praised the interagency cooperation practiced at the first two locations and found that they supported wildfire programs effectively. At the same time, the report urged that steps be taken toward further interagency cooperation, especially in planning, staffing, and equipment deployment. The report also found that the Western Slope Fire Center was not performing its intended functions—to centralize and coordinate the use of expensive air-

craft — due in large part to a lack of delegated authority to do so.

The report also recommended steps to improve aircraft management in BLM.

Subsequent Action Necessary authority was delegated to the Western Slope Office and to State Fire Management Officers as recommended.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Organization Bureau of Land Management.

Title and Date *Law Enforcement Program Analysis*, October 1978.

Major Findings

- A complete integration of law enforcement and natural-resource management has not taken place.
- Law enforcement is viewed as a criminal justice function ancillary to natural resources.
- There is a lack of adequate articulation that law enforcement is confined to enforcement of criminal violations and not used in civil or administrative processes.
- There is a distinct need for authority to issue citations.

Subsequent Action Law enforcement specialists and their particular perspective on land use planning are being gradually integrated into BLM's land use planning programs. BLM is supporting legislation to obtain citation authority.

Organization Department of the Interior, Office of the Inspector General.

Title and Date *Review of Implementation of Public Law 94-565, as amended, Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act*, June 1979.

Major Findings The report found much of the revenue-sharing data furnished by States to be inaccurate, due to misunderstandings, lack of concern, or lack of ability to report required information, and recommended requiring all State-submitted data to be audited by independent certified public accountants or qualified State auditors.

Subsequent Action Proposed regulations were issued in a Notice of Rulemaking dated January 24, 1980.

Organization General Accounting Office.

Title and Date *Alternatives for Achieving Greater Equities in Federal Land Payment Program*, June 1979.

Major Findings and Subsequent Action See information above regarding report by the Office of the Inspector General.

Management of Special Areas

4

This appendix describes BLM's program to manage special areas on the public lands which, because of their significant values, require more intensive management than other areas. In addition, this appendix describes special public land areas which are currently under special management or are being considered for special management attention.

Special Areas Defined

"Special areas" are public lands which have been formally designated—through legislative, Secretarial, or Bureau action—for intensive management in order to:

- protect significant, unique, or unusual natural and cultural resource values;
- protect the life and safety of public land users from significant natural hazards;
- manage unique or especially demanding combinations of multiple-resource values;
- manage significant public recreation-use opportunities.

The management of special areas operates within the common framework of multiple use and sustained yield. The nature of the values in each area determines the management mix of resource development and production objectives with environmental protection or conservation objectives. In some areas, such as areas of critical environmental concern, the protection of significant values will be the controlling objective and other resource uses can take place only if they are compatible with the protection of the significant values.

The Bureau has for many years been identifying, designating, and managing special areas. Types of areas designated on the public lands include, but are not limited to: Research Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Areas, Cultural Areas, Primitive Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Recreation Lands, National Conservation Areas, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, and Wild Horse Ranges.

Recent legislation and Executive direction have resulted in additional efforts to identify, designate, and manage special areas. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 directed the Bureau to evaluate the public lands for wilderness values and to recommend appropriate areas to Congress for wilderness designation. FLPMA also directed the Bureau to identify, designate, and protect areas of critical environmental concern. In addition, the President's 1979 Environmental Message recognized that significant natural and cultural resource values occur on the public lands and directed the Bureau to give special management attention to protecting them.

Consequently, the Bureau has been evaluating the effectiveness of all of its existing processes for identifying, designating, and managing special areas on the public lands. This effort will update procedures and eliminate duplications of effort.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC's)

Section 103(a) of FLPMA defines ACEC's as "areas within the public lands where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural and scenic values, fish and wildlife resources and other natural systems and processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards." In section 202(c) the Act directs the Secretary to give priority to the designation and protection of areas of critical environmental concern in the development and revision of land use plans. Draft procedures for a process to identify, designate, and manage ACEC's through the BLM management planning procedure were published in the *Federal Register* on June 6, 1979. Final guidelines, developed with consideration of public review, are proposed to be issued in the late spring of 1980.

The ACEC process is accomplished through BLM's on-the-ground resource management planning process. It is an integral part of each resource area's inventory and planning procedure. An approved Resource Management Plan constitutes the official designation of an ACEC, and through this document, BLM commits itself to managing the resource(s), value(s), or hazard(s) for which the area was designated an ACEC.

While protection is the primary management objective for ACEC's, a range of multiple-use activities (including specified kinds and degrees of development and commodity production) may take place within a particular ACEC, provided that the important environmental resources involved, or human lives, are not damaged or endangered.

Bureau efforts to date, regarding the ACEC process, consist of including the consideration of ACEC's in all scheduled planning efforts. For example, the draft plan for the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) proposed some 50 ACEC's for designation. The CDCA proposed plan, to be completed on September 30, 1980, will include designated ACEC's.

In the past, the Bureau has designated special management areas under its general authority to protect public health and safety, the natural environment, and areas of cultural or scientific value, and to prevent excessive soil erosion and destruction of plant life and wildlife habitat. Some of these areas—those that contain important natural and cultural resources or those that protect health and safety—are considered to be ACEC's and are managed under the specific authority of FLPMA. Some past designations were recognition oriented. The ACEC process does more than provide recognition; it is a process for (1) determining the special management needs of important environmental resources or hazards, (2) making a commitment to continuing high-priority management under the requirements of FLPMA, and (3) providing such management.

King Range National Conservation Area (KRNCA)

Established by the Act of October 10, 1970, P.L. 91-476 (84 Stat 1067), the KRNCA is an area of 54,000 acres of rugged, timber- and brush-covered mountains and Pacific beaches approximately 200 miles north of San Francisco. The Act directed the Secretary "to consolidate and manage the public lands in the area with the purpose of conserving and developing . . . the lands and other resources thereon under a program of multiple use and sustained yield." It directed him to develop a comprehensive land use plan for the area and to manage the area "to satisfy all legitimate requirements for the available resources . . . taking into consideration total requirement and total availability of resources, irrespective of ownership and location." It also authorized the Secretary to reforest and revegetate lands and install soil and water conserving works and practices to reduce erosion and im-

prove forage and timber capacity.

In addition, the Secretary was authorized to acquire lands or easements through purchase or exchange. Following preparation of the King Range Land Use Plan and Management Program in 1974, the area was officially designated the King Range National Conservation Area.

Full implementation of the management plan and program will involve investment in a variety of resource management and improvement practices. To maximize timber productivity, conversion of sites occupied by non-commercial species, and pre-commercial thinning and planting, are needed. Fencing, development of additional water sources, structural soil stabilization measures, reseeding, and an increased monitoring program will be needed to reach livestock-forage and watershed potential. Stream clearance, reintroduction of Roosevelt Elk, and further identification of wildlife-habitat management areas is needed to implement the program. An increase in recreation management personnel and construction of six public-contact sites and campgrounds are planned, as are restoration of the Punta Gorda Lighthouse and maintenance of 10 miles of hiking trail. One Wilderness Study Area report is currently being completed and a recommendation to Congress will be prepared by FY 1985.

In the King Range Act, as amended, Congress authorized the expenditure of Land and Water Conservation Fund monies for purchase of lands with high recreation value. Approximately 5000 acres are scheduled for acquisition under this authority. An additional 3200 acres on non-recreational land will be acquired during the FY 1982-1985 period with funding from the Bureau's Acquisition, Construction and Maintenance Appropriation.

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA)

The California Desert Conservation Area was established by section 601 of FLPMA. The Conservation Area encompasses 25 million acres, about one-fourth of California's land area. About half of the CDCA is BLM-administered public land. The CDCA stretches 500 miles, from north of Death Valley National Monument to the Mexican border, and is 200 miles wide, from the Colorado River to the fringes of the Los Angeles Basin. The authorizing legislation required that a comprehensive, long-range plan be completed before September 30, 1980, and that an interim management program be implemented to regulate use and development of public lands and to protect critical resource values. A draft plan has been prepared and is currently under public review, with publication of the final plan and environmental impact statement scheduled before the end of September. A number of program actions have been identified through public involvement in the planning process. Irrespective of which plan alternative is adopted, these actions will be implemented as part of the planning program for the Conservation Area.

The CDCA plan recommends major adjustments in land tenure, including exchanges and State Indemnity Selections. Exchanges with the State of California and Southern Pacific Land Company would rationalize ownership patterns and permit more effective management. A number of boundary adjustments with the Forest Service are also needed for the same reason.

Expansion of the southern California urban area has increased demand for utilities corridors, solid waste disposal sites, recreation and other community-use sites, and lands for airports and urban and industrial expansion. Review of withdrawals must also be completed by 1991 to meet FLPMA's deadline.

An increase in applications for pipelines, communications facilities, and energy transmission rights-of-way is anticipated, as well as a need for additional public lands for power-plant siting. Additional capability is needed to meet these demands.

The CDCA contains a number of leasable, salable, and locatable minerals including petroleum, phosphates, borates, sodium and potassium salts, sand and gravel, gold, zinc, and iron. Mineral exploration activities are continuing to expand as the value of industrial minerals and precious metals increases; known reserves of the 18 most important commodities are valued at about $135 billion, with undiscovered sources bringing the overall value to several hundred billion dollars. There are also six areas known to have high potential for geothermal steam development in the CDCA. The Bureau must increase its surface management activities in accordance with section 601 of P.L. 94-579, and an expansion of its capability to process patent-lease and material-sale applications is needed. Additional coordination with county governments on surface protection will be required due to the passage of California's Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975.

The CDCA is grazed by approximately 60,000 sheep and 10,000 cattle all or part of each year. Rangeland condition has deteriorated over time and some reduction in forage allocation to livestock is anticipated. Increased manpower and funding will be utilized to accomplish the use adjustments, to prepare, implement, and supervise new allotment management plans, and to construct and maintain range improvements.

Wild burro populations occur in substantial portions of the CDCA and have been increasing approximately 25 percent annually. Burro populations have contributed to the overgrazing in the CDCA; burros compete successfully with wildlife and domestic livestock for scarce forage and water. Removal of excess animals and an expanded adoption program will be needed to maintain burro populations at sustainable levels.

The CDCA contains over 100 habitat types, supporting over 640 vertebrate species and thousands of invertebrates. Seven species are included on the Federal Threatened and Endangered Species lists, and these seven plus six more appear on the State lists. Of 1200 species of vegetation occurring on the CDCA, up to 170 may be rare or endangered; some of these are found only within the Conservation Area. Conflicting resource uses and an increase in human activity are impacting these species and their habitats.

Current recreational use is estimated to be 17 million visitor-days annually, with intensive-use areas receiving 2.5 million visitors. This heavy use places increased pressure on sensitive desert resources, including cultural and Native American sites, wildlife habitat, sensitive soils, and the quality of desert solitude. Management plans for specific use areas will be developed and implemented. Implementation of a comprehensive Visitor Services Program is scheduled for FY 1981, providing a much-needed increase in the on-the-ground cadre of Rangers, Visitor Use Specialists, Interpretive Specialists, and Information and Education Specialists, who will provide protection to desert resources as well as assistance and protection to public lands visitors.

Designation by 1987 of roads and trails in areas classified for limited use, use supervision in areas designated open to vehicle use, and supervision of competitive ORV events constitute a major workload that will require increased capability. At stake are visitor safety and the protection of critical resources, particularly sensitive plants, animals, soils, ecological systems, and cultural and American Indian values.

The Conservation Area is extraordinarily rich in cultural values: over 12,000 archeological and historical sites have been identified and there may be over 100,000 sites in the CDCA. Natural deterioration and vandalism are affecting hundreds of sites; only 5 percent of the currently known sites are adequately protected. The CDCA also contains numerous areas of unique importance to the religion and traditions of Native Americans which are not being adequately protected. A program for protection and stabilization of these important sites and values will be implemented.

A large number of areas of critical environmental concern have been identified in the planning process. These are areas requiring specific management action to protect fragile resources or protect the public from natural hazards. The Bureau will institute protection by the end of FY 1982.

Reports for all Wilderness Study Areas in the CDCA will be submitted to Congress by the end of FY 1982. Pending Congressional action on designation, the Bureau will continue to provide interim protection for all Wilderness Study Areas. Management activities in designated wilderness could commence in FY 1985.

Snake River Birds of Prey Area

On May 9, 1980, Senator Jackson introduced legislation (S. 2683) to amend Title VI of FLPMA and establish the Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area. The bill would designate the area a National Conservation Area (NCA) for the purpose of protecting raptor habitat within a framework of multiple use and sustained yield in an area within and adjacent to the Snake River Canyon in southwestern Idaho.

A management plan and environmental impact statement have been prepared for the area. The bill directs that implementation of the plan continue until an update is prepared. It would not impose any constraint on State or private lands within the area and provides for continuation of existing uses, including livestock grazing and seasonal use of a portion of the area for National Guard training. A program of education, research, and scientific investigation would be carried out to support sound management. Federal lands within the NCA would be protected from disposal and conversion to agricultural or other uses inconsistent with protection of the raptor resource. The Area would be withdrawn from operation of the Mining Law of 1872; however, at the Secretary's discretion, hardrock minerals could be developed under lease. The bill provides for limited acquisition of State and privately owned lands in the area. It limits Federal activities, except those related to national defense, to actions that are consistent with protection of raptor habitat. It also includes provisions for reaching cooperative agreements with State and local governments.

The Snake River Birds of Prey NCA program includes land-acquisition actions, studies of raptor and prey base relationships and of recreation use, vegetation inventories, and management actions to maintain and improve habitat, propagate Peregrine Falcons, and review and revise the management plan for the area.

Alaska Natural Resource Areas

On February 11, 1980, four Natural Resource Areas (NRA's) totaling 3.21 million acres were established under Sec. 204(c) of FLPMA. At the Secretary's direction, these four areas are to be managed by the Bureau of Land Management under FLPMA and other applicable law. The primary purposes of the withdrawals are to provide for long-term protection and management of

compatible uses and to conserve outstanding values, leaving them unimpaired for continued public enjoyment. Because of the close proximity to National Monuments, close coordination and cooperation with the National Park Service is required. Other requirements include the development of "specific regulations" and "comprehensive management plans."

Acreage of Natural Resource Areas

Aniakchak	0.16 million acres
Lake Clark	1.15 million acres
Noatak	0.66 million acres
Wrangell-St. Elias	1.24 million acres
Total	3.21 million acres

Opportunities for local rural residents to continue subsistence use and for scientific research, environmental education and interpretation, sport hunting, fishing, trapping, hiking, camping, boating and river trips, and recreation are to be assured. Existing types and levels of uses, with the exception of mineral exploration, were deemed by the Secretary to be primarily compatible with the long-term protection of existing natural resource values. All activities are to be compatible and are not to alter significantly existing conditions.

Sport hunting and subsistence uses must be monitored in cooperation with the State. Sport hunting is a significant use for all four Natural Resource Areas. Sport hunting increased dramatically in these four areas this last year due to the closing of vast areas within the new national monuments, which formerly were open to such use.

All mineral actions will be carried out under the provisions of 43 CFR 3802. With the potential exception of the Wrangell-St. Elias unit, mineral development—subject to existing valid rights—has been identified by the Secretary as an unacceptable resource use. There are 1,884 mining claims within these units.

Existing Mining Claims

	Claims of Record	Active Claims	Comments
Aniakchak	0	0	Oil and Gas Potential
Lake Clark	101	68	Hardrock Potential
Noatak	18	0	Little Mineral Potential
Wrangell-St. Elias	1,765	924	Mineral Management Zone Potential

Priority attention will be given to mining activities within the four NRA's. Plans of operation for mining activities will need technical review for conformance with 43 CFR 3802 and the interim management plans for the

areas. As appropriate, environmental protection stipulations will be prepared and added to approvals. All mining will be monitored for compliance.

Archeological, historical, and cultural values are significant in all four units. These will require identification, protection, and interpretation. The Noatak NRA is also within the Krusenstern National Archeologic District as well as the International Noatak Biosphere Preserve.

Fisheries (commercial, subsistence, and sport) are significant in the Aniakchak and Lake Clark units. Caribou use is important in the Lake Clark and Wrangell-St. Elias units. The latter has a remnant caribou herd which will require special attention.

Geologic features and their significance will require identification and interpretation in the Aniakchak, Lake Clark, and Wrangell-St. Elias units.

Visitor management to prevent overuse and to avoid conflicts with subsistence is required. Significant commercial recreation opportunities exist in the Lake Clark and Wrangell-St. Elias units.

Special attention will be required to identify trails and areas where established off-road vehicle use (primarily by sport hunters) is compatible with the purposes of the NRA.

Special provision was made to exclude lands adjacent to the Noatak for a transportation corridor. Uses in that corridor will be monitored to ensure that the Natural Resource Area is not adversely impacted.

Probable areas of cooperation, other than planning and inventory work with the National Park Service, include technical assistance in developing an interpretation plan and in some use monitoring. The degree and extent of such cooperation will be set forth in a Cooperative Agreement. Similar cooperative arrangements will be made with the State and adjacent land owners, including the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Anasazi Area

Establishment of a National Conservation Area in the Sacred Mountain Planning Unit, in southwestern Colorado, has been proposed. The area contains significant archeological resources associated with the Anasazi—a prehistoric people who lived in the area until about 1300 A.D. Major carbon dioxide deposits, oil and gas fields in current production, and potentially valuable coal deposits are also found in the 217,000-acre planning unit. The area is used for grazing domestic livestock and contains wildlife and fisheries values.

The proposal involves designation of the planning unit as a National Conservation Area, preparation of a management plan to provide for development of the area's resources, provision of facilities for research interpretation and stabilization of unique cultural resources, and operation of the Anasazi Heritage Center (a facility proposed for construction as part of the Water and Power Service's Dolores Project).

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1981—676-637